United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2003 No. 166

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 17, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE PENCE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1261. An act to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1824. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to reauthorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates.

NOTICE

If the 108th Congress, 1st Session, adjourns sine die on or before November 21, 2003, a final issue of the Congressional Record for the 108th Congress, 1st Session, will be published on Monday, December 15, 2003, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT–60 or S–410A of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Friday, December 12, 2003. The final issue will be dated Monday, December 15, 2003, and will be delivered on Tuesday, December 16, 2003.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at ''Record@Sec.Senate.gov''.

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at http://clerkhouse.house.gov/forms. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT–60 of the Capitol.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Printing Office, on 512–0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

ROBERT W. NEY, *Chairman.*

Printed on recycled paper.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

STEMMING THE SPREAD OF CARGO THEFT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, billions and billions of dollars are sapped from our economy each year by cargo theft. It is a staggering problem, and, at the same time, a problem that really no one is aware of.

Every day, millions of cargo carrying trucks transport their contents across the highways of our districts. And, every day, millions of dollars of goods are stolen from these trucks, often times with violent results.

Mr. Speaker, this week I will introduce legislation that will seek to address the growing tide of cargo theft in hopes of bringing awareness of this problem to the national spotlight.

With the prevalence of cargo theft today, insurance companies have placed a heavy burden on the trucking industry. The costs associated with investigation, insurance payments, are only exacerbating what is already an industry crisis.

Typical targets for cargo theft often include shipments of clothing, prescription drugs, computers and jewelry. A truckload of computer microprocessors can be worth millions of dollars. A single pallet of pharmaceuticals, another common target, can be worth upwards of $2 million dollars, and cargo containers are capable of carrying dozens of such pallets.

The high value-to-volume ratio of these goods has encouraged criminals previously involved in drug dealing to move into this area of activity, where they run less risk of detection and suffer less severe penalties if they are caught. The National Cargo Security Council reported that cargo worth $12 billion is stolen in the United States every year, and yet the penalties for cargo theft are lower than those for selling drugs.

Cargo thieves employ creative means to prey on cargo carriers and have managed to stay one step ahead of authorities. Thieves know what they want and where they can find it, striking cargo containers at ports and at trains and 18-wheelers.

Thieves will either roll the dice, stealing containers with unknown contents, or they will go as far as camping outside of distribution centers. This method is called ''full load truck theft.'' It involves monitoring shipments out of distribution centers that are known for putting out expensive goods. The thieves will then follow the trucks in rental cars waiting for the right time to pounce. This will often occur at truck rest stops, where the driver leaves the vehicle. The process can amazingly take but a few minutes. These professional criminals are usually licensed truck drivers, who can hot wire a truck quickly and efficiently.

The legislation that I have proposed will seek to finally give both lawmakers and law enforcement officials the tools they need to combat this growing crime. Cargo theft does not receive the attention it deserves because very little concrete information exists today concerning this problem. There currently is no all-inclusive database that collects, contains or processes distinct information and data concerning cargo theft. My bill would require the creation of such a database that will allow State and local law enforcement officials to coordinate reports of cargo theft, helping them prove to lawmakers just how severe this problem really is.

Also, after speaking with officials in my Congressional District, it has become clear to me that stricter criminal penalties are needed in order to keep criminals from turning to cargo theft. My bill does just this, requiring that the United States Sentencing Commission determine what sentencing enhancement must be made.

Finally, this legislation would ensure that cargo theft reports would be reflected as a separate category in the Uniform Crime Reporting System, the data collection system used by the FBI. Currently no such category exists, resulting in ambiguous data and the inability to track and monitor trends.

Mr. Speaker, Members in this Chamber need to be aware of this problem, a problem not only specific to the large port cities of this country, but a problem specific to all Congressional districts. Flowing up and down I–75, through the heart of my district, thieves transport goods to and from Miami. Billions of dollars are being sapped from our economy, and this body is doing little to stop it. It is time that we get aggressive and make our highways safe again for commerce.

This body must make an example of cargo thieves. We must let them know that they will not get away with merely a slap on the hand. And as sheriff's departments begin integrating special cargo theft task forces, we must arm them with the ability to prosecute criminals with stiffer penalties.

Mr. Speaker, my bill represents a cohesive effort backed by law enforcement and industry representatives alike. I urge Members to support this bill, in hopes of bringing acknowledgment of this fight against cargo theft at the Federal level.

With links even to terrorism, cargo theft is a problem that has flown under our radar screens for far too long. Until we strengthen these laws, this 30-year-old crime wave will persist, threatening our ports and roads and costing our economy billions of dollars.

LOOMING DIABETES EPIDEMIC CAUSING HEALTHCARE CRISIS

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the headlines shout out: ''Healthcare crisis looms.'' ''Diabetes epidemic.'' ''Increase in childhood obesity.'' Solutions abound, but the one which could make a real difference, prevention, is only paid lip service. We say ''an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure,'' but then we fail to reinvent our health policy to make prevention a cornerstone.

The facts are ominous, unrelenting and tell it all:

An obesity epidemic started in the early 1980s and equally impacts all age groups. Nearly one in four Americans are obese. Obesity is highly predictive of diabetes.

One in three children now being born in the United States ultimately will become diabetic.

Diabetes incidence increased 61 percent in the last decade; 76 percent for people in their thirties.

An alarming British study reported one-third of 5-year-old girls were overweight and showing signs of developing Type II diabetes, formerly called adult onset diabetes.

The Surgeon General in his December 2001 report left no doubt where we are headed. ''Left unabated, overweight and obesity may soon cause as much preventable disease and death as cigarette smoking.''

The healthcare costs to deal with these trends are overwhelming and unaffordable. The National Institutes of Health has estimated that diabetes costs the United States close to $138 billion each year in direct and indirect costs. Let me repeat, $138 billion. We cannot afford to double, triple and quadruple these costs. Even if we could find the resources, would this be a wise expenditure of our finite healthcare dollars?

Today we spend 95 percent of our healthcare dollars on treating chronic and acute illnesses, many of which could be prevented in the first place. In other cases we could at least delay the onset of disease for a number of years and provide a higher quality of life. The dollars we spend on prevention are minuscule, and we do not track the outcomes in a meaningful way.

This Nation needs a new approach to healthcare, which puts prevention front and center. The key to prevention is personal responsibility and personal action. If people are given the facts and alternatives, they can take charge of their health.

We are facing an epidemic of diabetes in New Mexico due to obesity and unhealthy lifestyles. Minority communities are disproportionately impacted. But there is hope in many of our communities, where individuals are taking charge of their health and their future.

I was in the Navajo community of Thoreau recently and saw some dynamic seniors reshaping the health of their community. These Navajo seniors knew that decades ago, when the Navajo people were leading an active life and herding their sheep and livestock and eating traditional food, there was very little disease. They remember diabetes and other modern ailments were also unheard of in the Navajo population. So with the help of the Centers for Disease Control and the University of New Mexico Preventive Health Center, they designed a menu of healthy traditional foods.

They call the regimen of regular exercise and healthier eating ''The Healthy Path.'' The seniors are teaching younger parents and their grandchildren the benefits of these healthier foods and how to begin The Healthy Path. Word has spread, and there are now a dozen healthy path initiatives ongoing in Navajo chapter houses.

This is not rocket science. We know prevention works. We have the tests and screening to know when someone is pre-diabetic, on a path to diabetes. Doctors have known for years that regular exercise, weight loss and healthy diet will virtually eliminate Type II diabetes. Let us put this knowledge to work and create healthier individuals and communities.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, all Your ways are just. You alone are the source of true compassion and love. We turn to You to be strengthened this week so we may accomplish the work You set before us.

By their deeds You judge all peoples. May this Congress prove to be just stewards of the resources of this Nation and worthy leaders who gain the respect of the people.

Above all and in all, guide their judgment and place prudence and practicality in their hearts. May they meet their responsibilities with fair and open debate, seeking the best means to achieve common goals.

May their work, conversations and all their efforts be dedicated to Your service and meet the needs of the least in our midst now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RECOGNIZING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE FOR 50 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) recognizing the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture for 50 years of outstanding service to the Nation through agricultural research.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 22

Whereas the Agricultural Research Service is the primary research agency of the Department of Agriculture and provides the Department of Agriculture and other Federal offices with objective research that is critical to the missions of those offices;

Whereas the agricultural research conducted by the Agricultural Research Service has an enormous impact on the economic viability of agriculture in the United States and around the world;

Whereas people around the world, especially rural Americans, enjoy a higher quality of life due in part to the work of the Agricultural Research Service to expand scientific knowledge;

Whereas the Agricultural Research Service has achieved major scientific breakthroughs that have benefited farmers, ranchers, agribusiness, and consumers;

Whereas the Agricultural Research Service has made scientific discoveries and technological developments that address agricultural problems of broad scope and high national priority, ensure safe and high quality food and other agricultural products that meet nutritional needs, and maintain a quality environment and natural resource base; and

Whereas the Agricultural Research Service continues to play a vital role in maintaining the global competitiveness and leadership of the United States in the next millennium: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) recognizes the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture for 50 years of outstanding service to the Nation through agricultural research; and

(2) acknowledges the promise of the Agricultural Research Service to continue to perform outstanding agricultural research in the next 50 years and beyond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 22 honors the Agricultural Research Service, the primary research agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. On Wednesday, October 29, the House Committee on Agriculture reported out an identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 74.

Although ARS can trace its heritage back to early 19th century seed collection activities in the U.S. Patent Office, it was originally organized on November 2, 1953, when the USDA consolidated most of its research functions into one newly-named Agricultural Research Service.

I am very pleased to help ARS mark its 50th anniversary and to use this occasion to recognize the important contributions ARS has made to the agricultural community, as well as to our Nation.

ARS is a public institution that conducts agricultural research exclusively for the public good. ARS scientists and other employees serve the Nation in their capacity of public servants and are accountable to the American people. The research is often long-term and costly and unlikely to be undertaken by the private sector. The ARS discoveries and innovations touch the lives of every American through the food we eat, the clothes we wear, and the environment in which we all live. Those of us from rural districts see firsthand the impact of ARS research but we should all be mindful of the agency's unique contributions to the quality of life for people everywhere. This impact is far greater than anyone could have imagined 50 years ago.

To mark its five decades of public service and to look forward to the next 50 years and beyond of even greater service to this Nation, ARS will be celebrating with various events throughout the next year. In fact, in recognition of the local and national partnerships that are the foundation of much of their research, ARS has declared this a year of outreach and will hold an open house or in some other way throw open their doors at each location over the next year. With over

100 locations across the country, I hope you will support these activities and provide special encouragement for continued ARS leadership in the agricultural, natural resources and technological arenas.

I urge all Members to support this important resolution.

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

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

I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 22, a resolution commending the USDA Agricultural Research Service for their 50 years of service to America. For half a century now, the ARS has been a leader in publicly-funded basic and applied research. Given the structure of U.S. agriculture, individual family farms are certainly not able to provide for their own technical and research needs. Publicly-funded research entities such as ARS can provide the lead for long-term projects and have been an obvious and significant success to the benefit of the American people.

Over the years, ARS scientists have made hundreds of technical advances, released thousands of new plant varieties, and contributed to the abundant food supply that all our citizens enjoy. My own State and district have benefited in many tangible ways from the work of the Agricultural Research Service, and I doubt that there are any of us here today who could not say the same thing. The ARS has contributed so very much to advances in the quality and quantity of our food supply, benefiting rural and urban dwellers alike.

I congratulate the Agricultural Research Service on their 50 years of service and I look forward to continue working with them to enhance both American agriculture and the well-being of all our citizens. I encourage all Members to support this well-deserved resolution of commendation.

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

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

This is a very important resolution. The ARS has done some wonderful work for us. This is one small way that Congress can say thank you and recognize their efforts.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Agriculture Research Service (ARS) of the Department of Agriculture for 50 years of outstanding research. ARS is the established leader in agriculture science, producing quality research used by many to help create responsible science-based policy. As we prepare to celebrate their accomplishments of the past half-century, it is also an opportunity for us to bear in mind future achievements.

ARS is the largest science organization in the world dedicated to agriculture research. As the Department of Agriculture's in-house agency. ARS conducts research to solve problems that are of high national priority and in the best interests of the Nation. This science is vital to the mission area of several Department of Agriculture agencies such as the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS), Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyard Administration (GIPSA), and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). ARS also serves a number of other Federal agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and some components within the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Department of Interior (DOI). Not only is ARS responsible for providing data to these agencies, they also distribute information to producers, consumers, and other stakeholders.

It is easy to see that research is an essential tool, but it is also a worthy investment. Federal agriculture research is a critical element in maintaining our competitive edge in the international arena as well as helps us address environmental challenges. We can better protect our resources from plant pests and animal diseases and can expect improved water quality, resource conservation, and renewable sources of energy. The value of these should research programs benefit not only agriculture, but all Americans.

ARS is able to carry out their mission of providing scientific research through collaborative efforts. There are more than 2,100 scientists conducting research at approximately 100 locations across the country and overseas. At any given time, ARS has more than 1,000 research projects underway, each of which is incorporated into one of 22 national programs. The network of laboratories and research centers across the country allows ARS to address problems quickly and efficiently.

I am proud to represent one center that has significantly contributed to this effort, the Beltsville Area Research Center (BARC), located in Beltsville, MD. I have worked with BARC over the years and have witnessed the work these researchers do and how critical it is to our daily lives.

BARC is the largest and most diversified agricultural research complex in the world. Beltsville's record of accomplishments and programs has earned the center international accolade and attracts thousands of visitors each year. Research in the Beltsville area addresses issues of agriculture importance and high national priority through programs in the Plant Sciences Institute, the Animal and Natural Resources Institute, the Beltsville Human Nutrition Research Center, and the U.S. National Arboretum. I am sure BARC will live up to its reputation of producing high quality research on the cutting edge that will propel U.S. agriculture into the future.

We should take great pride for the many milestones that have been met and continue to support ARS and American agriculture.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 50 years, the Agriculture Research Service, or ARS as they are better known, has performed indispensable agriculture research across the country, including in the Congressional District I represent. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize ARS in honor of their 50th anniversary as the U.S. Department of Agriculture's main research authority.

From improving food safety to protecting crops and livestock, ARS has proved itself invaluable throughout the past 50 years. As the Department of Agriculture's research arm, they have been able to translate their raw data into profitability for farmers and lower costs for consumers. ARS has formed lasting partnerships with Universities throughout the nation, and has done so at Purdue University since 1965 when they released their first nationwide soil erosion-prediction equation. ARS maintains top-notch Crop Production and Pest Control, Livestock Behavior, and National Soil Erosion Laboratory units at Purdue. ARS, in conjunction with Purdue, continues to stay on the leading edge of agricultural research. Just this summer, they released their cutting edge Water Erosion Prediction Project over the Internet with software known as GeoWEPP.

From this research station, individuals such as Larry Dunkle, Donald Lay, and Darrell Norton have been able to study the agricultural dynamic of Northwest Indiana. They have all contributed a fundamental service to Northwest Indiana as well as the rest of the state, and their service with the ARS is indeed recognized and deeply appreciated. The agricultural community of Northwest Indiana has counted on their contributions of ARS for 50 years now, and that strong partnership will continue into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me as I congratulate ARS and its researchers on their 50th anniversary by supporting S.J. Res. 22. I would further like to express my gratitude for their service to the agricultural community. Their accomplishments speak volumes, and I thank them for their vital public service.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 22.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NATIONAL VETERINARY MEDICAL SERVICE ACT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1367) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a loan repayment program regarding the provision of veterinary services in shortage situations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1367

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

SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Veterinary Medical Service Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM REGARDING VETERINARY MEDICINE.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7

U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1415 the following new section:

"SEC. 1415A. VETERINARY MEDICINE LOAN REPAYMENT.

''(a) PROGRAM.—

''(1) SERVICE IN SHORTAGE SITUATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out a program of entering into agreements with veterinarians under which the veterinarians agree to provide, for a period of time as determined by the Secretary and specified in the agreement, veterinary services in veterinarian shortage situations. For each year of such service under an agreement under this paragraph, the Secretary shall pay an amount, as determined by the Secretary and specified in the agreement, of the principal and interest of qualifying educational loans of the veterinarians.

''(2) SERVICE TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into agreements of one year duration with veterinarians who have agreements pursuant to paragraph (1) for such veterinarians to provide services to the Federal Government in emergency situations, as determined by the Secretary, under terms and conditions specified in the agreement. Pursuant to an agreement under this paragraph, the Secretary shall pay an amount, in addition to the amount paid pursuant to the agreement in paragraph (1), as determined by the Secretary and specified in the agreement, of the principal and interest of qualifying educational loans of the veterinarians.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Agreements entered into under this paragraph shall include the following:

''(i) A veterinarian shall not be required to serve more than 60 working days per year of the agreement.

''(ii) A veterinarian who provides service pursuant to the agreement shall receive a salary commensurate with the duties and shall be reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses as appropriate for the duration of the service.

''(b) DETERMINATION OF VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATIONS.—In determining 'veterinarian shortage situations' the Secretary may consider the following:

''(1) Urban or rural areas that the Secretary determines have a shortage of veterinarians.

''(2) Areas of veterinary practice that the Secretary determines have a shortage of veterinarians, such as public health, epidemiology, and food safety.

''(3) Areas of veterinary need in the Federal Government.

''(4) Other factors that the Secretary considers to be relevant.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may carry out this program directly or enter into agreements with another Federal agency or other service provider to assist in the administration of this program.

''(2) BREACH REMEDIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Agreements with program participants shall provide remedies for any breach of an agreement by a participant, including repayment or partial repayment of financial assistance received, with interest.

''(B) AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—Funds recovered under this subsection shall be credited to the account available to carry out this section and shall remain available until expended.

''(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may grant a waiver of the repayment obligation for breach of contract in the event of extreme hardship or extreme need, as determined by the Secretary.

''(4) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall develop regulations to determine the amount of loan repayment for a year of service by a veterinarian. In making the determination, the Secretary shall consider the extent to which such determination—

''(A) affects the ability of the Secretary to maximize the number of agreements that can be provided under the Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program from the amounts appropriated for such agreements; and

''(B) provides an incentive to serve in veterinary service shortage areas with the greatest need.

''(5) QUALIFYING EDUCATIONAL LOANS.—Loan repayments provided under this section may consist of payments on behalf of participating individuals of the principal and interest on government and commercial loans received by the individual for attendance of the individual at an accredited college of veterinary medicine resulting in a degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine or the equivalent, which loans were made for—

''(A) tuition expenses;

''(B) all other reasonable educational expenses, including fees, books, and laboratory expenses, incurred by the individual; or

''(C) reasonable living expenses as determined by the Secretary.

''(6) REPAYMENT SCHEDULE.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the holder of any loan for which payments are made under this section to establish a schedule for the making of such payments.

''(7) TAX LIABILITY.—In addition to educational loan repayments, the Secretary shall make such additional payments to participants as the Secretary determines to be appropriate for the purpose of providing reimbursements to participants for individual tax liability resulting from participation in this program.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this section such sums as may be necessary and such sums shall remain available to the Secretary for the purposes of this section until expended.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1367, the National Veterinary Medical Service Act. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) for his leadership on this issue.

H.R. 1367, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the availability of appropriations, to assist veterinarians in repaying their educational loans if they agree to provide veterinary medical services in areas where the Secretary has determined a shortage of qualified veterinarians exists.

In addition, at the request of the USDA, the bill authorizes the Secretary to provide additional loan repayment for those veterinarians in this program who agree to provide services to the Federal Government in emergency situations. Examples of when this may be important include California's recent experience with Exotic Newcastle Disease, or in a case closer to home, an outbreak of low pathogenic Avian influenza in Virginia here in 2002. In both of these examples, the Federal Government, acting through USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, mobilizes its resources in order to detect, control and eradicate disease. Having a pool of qualified veterinarians able to assist in a time of emergency simply bolsters our ability to rapidly contain diseases which can cost our economy millions or even billions of dollars.

Once again, I commend the gentleman from Mississippi for his hard work on this important legislation and urge all Members to support it.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1367, the National Veterinary Medical Services Act. I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for their good work in advancing this legislation.

Assuring an adequate supply of veterinarians in many underserved rural and urban areas is a critical issue for our Nation's animal health infrastructure. It is generally private veterinarians who are the first to identify and respond to animal disease outbreaks. In addition, there is a great need for private veterinarians to supplement the Federal response during future animal health emergencies. The assistance that this legislation will provide to encourage veterinary practice in underserved areas, along with the creation of something like a ''National Guard'' for private veterinarians who can be called up in emergencies, should wisely enhance our preparation to deal with future animal health emergencies.

The bill under consideration will help to encourage both goals through a very modest public investment with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I believe H.R. 1367 is a good, cost-effective policy. I encourage Members to support passage of this bill.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the author of the bill.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and all of his staff who have worked in a bipartisan manner with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and myself as we have brought this much-needed legislation through the committee and now to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I want to thank those leaders at Mississippi State University who had the foresight and the ability to bring to our attention here on the committee and in my office the need that we have, the critical need, the desperate need that we have to be able to help our students, our veterinarian students who

often end up their education with up to, on average, $70,000 in debt. When that occurs, it is so difficult for them to pay the debt and practice in rural or underserved markets and make the type of salary that is needed to be able to retire that debt and pay that debt and raise a family, start a family and start their dreams. And so we are doing just as we have done for medical doctors and dentists and nurses and teachers, and, that is, starting a program that will help them repay their debt, that will pick up those obligations, if in return, they will agree to serve in those areas where we have critical shortages in the rural and the large-animal practices and the underserved markets. Not only will they fill that critical need that is so important not only in animal health, but as it relates to the connections to human health, and in national security, and in homeland security, where we have new threats of bioterrorism, or we have the outbreaks of dreaded diseases that we have seen ravage not only Europe, the economy and the agricultural economy in Europe with mad cow disease, that in those times of crisis those that sign up and meet these requirements and then have their debts repaid, will agree to serve their country, in essence, a National Guard for veterinarians.

□ 1415

So we see today a way to meet the critical shortage of veterinarians in rural and underserved markets. We see a way to encourage the service to our country in homeland security and to meet the threats of either bioterrorism or major animal disease outbreaks. This is much-needed legislation that will help us as we go forward.

Again, I want to thank the committee, the staff, the chairman, and the ranking member for all their help and assistance in getting us to this point. We hope that this legislation can pass not only today in the House but move quickly through the Senate as we address this much-needed legislation and to address the critical shortages that we face in rural districts like mine and across the country.

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

I would ask to engage the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman GOODLATTE) in a brief colloquy.

During the Committee consideration of H.R. 1367, I raised some concerns about the potential that implementation of this bill, should it be passed and signed into law, might include an arbitrary graduation cutoff date for veterinarians wishing to participate. We certainly do not want to preclude participation by veterinarians that may have years of valuable experience. This has been a problem with regard to a different educational loan repayment program that folks from my district have tried to access in the past. It is my understanding that nothing in this legislation before us today would encourage the establishment of such a standard by USDA. It is my understanding that any veterinarian who meets the general standards for participation would be eligible to apply for this program no matter how long might have elapsed since her or his graduation from an accredited school of veterinary medicine. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the bill language?

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding and for raising this issue. We have talked to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman GOODLATTE), and it is our understanding and intent that nothing in this language would preclude any veterinarian, no matter when they graduated from vet school, from applying or to participate so long as they have eligible student loan debt and meet other criteria for participation as described in the legislation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for helping to make this point clear.

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

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

I would like to thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING). I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I think veterinarians in some respects are like tourniquets: we do not need one often; but when we do need one, we need one rapidly; and in underserved areas, it could become a very serious problem. So I think this is an important piece of legislation. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues for this needed legislation which ensures the Federal Government's deep commitment to a highly trained and diverse workforce in rural and underserved areas, and encourages veterinarians to assist the U.S. Department of Agriculture in emergency disease outbreak situations. But we should go even further. In order to best maximize Federal Government resources, both in this program at the Department of Agriculture, as well as loan repayment programs throughout the Federal Government, we should allow competition within other aspects of the student loan program, including consolidation loans.

The 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act allowed Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) student loan borrowers who hold loans from more than one underlying lender to select from those lenders when consolidating their loans. This change has enabled many recent college graduates to refinance their loans at a lower fixed-interest rate. However, student loan borrowers who hold loans through a single lender must consolidate loans through their current lender. This rule is known as the "Single Holder Rule."

In order to ensure that we instill competition, we will need to make sure that during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, which is currently moving through the Education and the Workforce Committee, we repeal the single holder rule. I want to thank Chairman BOEHNER and Congressman MCKEON for their efforts to keep college costs under control during consideration of this important legislation. It will be part of my commitment to Federal agencies, students and families everywhere that they have the benefit of competition from qualified lenders in the program when they consolidate their loans and, thus, allow them to take advantage of historically low fixed interest rates—just as other borrowers are able to do every day.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1367, 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN APALACHICOLA NATIONAL FOREST, FLORIDA

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3217) to provide for the conveyance of several small parcels of National Forest System land in the Apalachicola National Forest, Florida, to resolve boundary discrepancies involving the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church of Wakulla County, Florida, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3217

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

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, APALACHICOLA NATIONAL FOREST, FLORIDA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture may convey, without consideration, to the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church of Wakulla County, Florida, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four parcels of real property in the Apalachicola National Forest, Florida, located in section 5 of township 5 south, range 2 west, Tallahassee meridian, and consisting of approximately 9.95 acres, 0.09 acres, 0.09 acres, and 0.096 acres, respectively, as depicted on a map, plat number 5–118, prepared as part of a 1983 Forest Service survey.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3217 allows the Forest Service to convey without consideration 10.2 acres of the Apalachicola National Forest to the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church of Wakulla County, Florida.

This parcel of land was purchased by the Mt. Trial church in the 1930s; but for a variety of reasons, the deed was never recorded. Unfortunately, the original landowner subsequently resold the land to the National Forest Service in the 1950s. While the Forest Service now technically owns the land, it is more than happy to return this cemetery to the church. This is a fair and equitable resolution to this unfortunate situation.

H.R. 3217 was marked up by the Committee on Agriculture on October 29, 2003. It was approved by the committee on a voice vote without amendment. The bill enjoys the support of the local community and the administration. I urge all Members to support this legislation and return this property to its rightful owner.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3217, legislation to convey several small parcels of National Forest System land in the Apalachicola National Forest in order to resolve boundary discrepancies involving the U.S. Forest Service and the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church of Wakulla County, Florida.

Briefly, H.R. 3217 would allow the Mt. Trial church to expand a cemetery that it maintains next to its church building. This legislation would correct boundary discrepancies that resulted from the church and the Forest Service claiming ownership to the same 10-acre tract of land.

By way of background, the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church is a historically African American church that purchased 10 acres of land in the 1930s in anticipation of expanding its cemetery. The church, however, never recorded the deed for the land purchased at the local county courthouse.

In 1938, the U.S. Forest Service purchased the same 10 acres of land as part of a larger tract that was incorporated into the Apalachicola National Forest. In that instance, the Forest Service did record its deed; and while there is no dispute about the validity of the church's purchase, the Department of Agriculture's legal counsel has ruled that because the Federal Government did file its deed with the county, it is the rightful owner of the property. I would also note that two graves are already located on the Federal Government property and the church's existing cemetery is full.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3217 will solve the boundary discrepancies by giving the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to transfer the property to the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church. I encourage my colleagues to support this measure. This measure has been brought to our attention by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

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

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

This is a fair and equitable way to deal with this problem. All parties agree to it, and hopefully the Members of the House will join us in support of this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3217.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3217, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR DESIGNATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE DISASTER LIAISON

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3157) to provide for the designation of a Department of Agriculture disaster liaison to assist State and local employees of the Department in coordination with other disaster agencies in response to a federally declared disaster area as a result of a disaster, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3157

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

SECTION 1. LIAISON FOR DISASTER EMERGENCIES.

(a) DEPLOYMENT OF DISASTER LIAISON.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall deploy disaster liaisons to State and local Department of Agriculture Service Centers in a federally declared disaster area whenever Federal Emergency Management Agency Personnel are deployed in that area, to coordinate Department programs with the appropriate disaster agencies designated under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—Disaster liaisons shall be selected from among Department employees who have experience providing emergency disaster relief in federally declared disaster areas.

(c) DUTIES.—A disaster liaison shall—

(1) serve as a liaison to State and Federal Emergency Services;

(2) be deployed to a federally declared disaster area to coordinate Department interagency programs in assistance to agricultural producers in the declared disaster area;

(3) facilitate the claims and applications of agricultural producers who are victims of the disaster that are forwarded to the Department by the appropriate State Department of Agriculture agency director; and

(4) coordinate with the Director of the State office of the appropriate Department agency to assist with the application for and distribution of economic assistance.

(d) DURATION OF DEPLOYMENT.—The deployment of a disaster liaison under subsection (a) may not exceed 30 days.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''federally declared disaster area'' means—

(1) an area covered by a Presidential declaration of major disaster, including a disaster caused by a wildfire, issued under section 301 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170); or

(2) determined to be a disaster area, including a disaster caused by a wildfire, by the Secretary under subpart A of part 1945 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3157, a bill to designate and deploy U.S. Department of Agriculture liaison teams to areas of the country declared disaster areas, was approved by the Committee on Agriculture on October 29 of this year.

The bill seeks to ensure prompt Federal assistance to agricultural producers in rural areas affected by natural disasters that have been declared by the President or the Secretary of Agriculture. The teams will coordinate the activities of USDA employees assisting agricultural producers within the disaster area. The teams will facilitate the making of claims and applications for economic assistance of affected producers and others as they deal with the agencies designated under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

During the business meeting to consider H.R. 3157, the committee considered and adopted as a substitute amendment four changes to the legislation as originally introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). These changes include directing the Secretary of Agriculture to use USDA Food and Agriculture Council as a point of contact for the liaison team, requiring the Secretary to make the deployment only when FEMA has been sent to the disaster area, providing that the team will conduct and conclude its business within 30 days of the deployment, and, finally, adding wildfire as a specific disaster under a secretarial disaster declaration.

The bill before the House this afternoon makes a minor amendment to the

committee-reported bill by returning to the Secretary of Agriculture the full discretion to assign USDA employees to the liaison positions, instead of acting through the Department's Food and Agriculture Council.

As I am certain my colleagues can understand, natural disasters over large geographical areas often are followed by chaotic circumstances on the ground. Traditionally, USDA has had a significant role along with FEMA in assisting farmers, ranchers, and other rural residents; and this bill attempts to make those circumstances more orderly and more predictable for our rural constituents during a time when those residents and the communities in which they live need Federal help.

I hope the House will join with me in supporting this bill that seeks to improve Federal disaster assistance on our farms and in rural communities.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3157 is a bipartisan piece of legislation that attempts to address the very serious issue of USDA program coordination and information dissemination during times of federally declared national disasters.

Currently, there is no statutory requirement that USDA make a representative available at the Emergency Operations Center following a catastrophic disaster. As a result, if a farmer or rancher suffers a loss due to a natural disaster, there is no USDA point of contact on site to answer questions or provide information about departmental relief programs. Such information is obviously critical, and this legislation simply ensures that farmers and ranchers will have access to an on-site USDA point of contact.

While expressing support for this bill, let me briefly address a bigger issue for farmers and ranchers that have been adversely affected by a disaster. The fact is there are only minimal standing disaster programs within USDA to help farmers and ranchers deal with the variety of losses that can occur as a result of a natural disaster. In effect, all that USDA on-site points of contact can do is to tell farmers and ranchers, Sorry, the United States Department of Agriculture cannot help you. In addition, farmers and ranchers do not qualify for Small Business Administration programs and, in point of fact, receive very little help from FEMA.

So again, while I support H.R. 3157, the bigger question is what can be done to provide farmers and ranchers with greater certainty in terms of permanent disaster programs so that they may have some hope of recovering from such disasters.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the Rural Disaster Liaison Bill (H.R. 3157).

This past May, my district saw devastating losses in the aftermath of a series of tornadoes.

Estimates indicate that our agriculture community in southwest Missouri lost an estimated $27 billion in damages.

On the ground at home following those tornadoes, I noticed that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) had no staff in the statewide disaster field office (DFO) where officials from FEMA and the Small Business Administration were helping individuals and business owners.

Because Disaster Act declarations make no arrangements for a USDA representative, a single voice from USDA was noticeably absent on the ground in Southwest Missouri during disaster response discussions in the days and weeks after those terrible tornadoes.

This legislation will bring greater coordination from the USDA's three major agencies—Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Farm Service Agency and Rural Development—by requiring that a liaison from USDA be a member of future Federal disaster response teams. This individual would be dispatched to a disaster to work side-by-side with representatives from the local Farm Service Agency (FSA) for 30 days to help find relief for those disaster victims. Once the 30 days are up, the liaison will return to his or her post in Washington, DC, and continue to work on behalf of the farmers and others who need the services that the USDA provides.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that a disaster response team is never necessary in any of the districts my colleagues represent. However, should disaster strike, let's make sure that our agriculture communities are represented and that they get the help they deserve in a prompt fashion.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 3157.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3157. I am proud to support this legislation that will help farmers recover from national disasters because I believe that far too often, farmers are not thought of during times of emergency.

Representative BLUNT has authored a good bill. I supported it in the House Agriculture Committee and I even introduced an amendment that would make sure that the people in my home State of California, who suffered from the recent wildfires, could be helped by this bill.

Too many Californians have no idea how they will get by without their orchards, olive groves, and other farming operations that burned to the ground.

This legislation will compel the Department of Agriculture to create disaster liaisons and dispatch them to disaster zones.

In California, we have suffered greatly from several wildfires that have caused great damage throughout the state.

In San Bernardino County, over 40,000 people were evacuated from their homes, and nearly 1,200 buildings burned to the ground.

Far too many people lost their homes, farms, and in some cases—their lives—to these wild fires.

This bill and my amendment are only a small step in the right direction. We must funnel Federal attention and resources to rebuild after these deadly wildfires and help prevent similar events in the future.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3157 would require USDA to designate employees of the Department to serve as disaster liaisons to State and local emergency agencies in a federally declared disaster area. These liaisons would be responsible for coordinating interagency programs and assisting agricultural producers in the area to navigate through the bureaucracy of Federal Government support.

I want to thank Majority Whip BLUNT for taking the initiative to introduce this legislation on behalf of farmers and growers in the United States. I was more than happy to sign on as the lead cosponsor because of a situation faced by a handful of growers in my congressional district earlier this year.

During this past April, an unusual hailstorm descended upon Merced Country, ruining acres and acres of peach orchards. That event set off a chain of events involving numerous agencies within USDA, which in turn led to me and my staff to negotiate on their behalf with countless officials and administrators throughout USDA attempting to elicit some type of assistance from the Federal Government. It was a trying experience to say the least.

When a disaster happens now, multiple USDA agencies involved with numerous programs actively assess damage in a disaster area, while compiling information from hundreds of phone calls and by talking to numerous disaster victims. This information is then assembled and sent to representatives of the State. The farmer is left to fend for himself or herself with no point of contact for follow up.

Those situations are what Mr. BLUNT and I are trying to avoid with this legislation.

When enacted, H.R. 3157 will require USDA to recognize the importance of quick response time to agricultural disasters by deploying an experienced disaster specialist to an affected area. This official will facilitate such things as crop insurance claims processing and other applications for economic assistance as well as provide one legitimate source of information and comfort from the Federal Government.

My growers affected by the hailstorm were continually given conflicting information from different USDA employees. It is imperative that growers, especially the more skeptical growers in my home State of California, be able to receive clear and concise information on how to proceed after a Federal disaster as been declared in order to most efficiently proceed to the next crop year.

H.R. 3157 is the right thing to do for America's agricultural industry and I am proud to be a sponsor of this bill.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member STENHOLM, and Majority Whip BLUNT for recognizing the importance of the legislation. I urge an aye vote on this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3157, which will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to designate employees of the Department of Agriculture to serve as liaisons between the federal agencies and state and local governments in the event of a federally declared disaster area.

As Delegate and long-term resident of Guam, I can attest to the debilitating state of confusion in the after math of a disaster. Just last year, individuals and businesses on Guam sustained millions of dollars in damage as result of the destruction wrought by two supertyphoons, Cha'at'an in May and Pongsona in December, 2002. While federal agencies worked quickly to implement disaster recovery plans for Guam, the central communications

mechanism between GovGuam and the various agencies through FEMA and its designated liaisons was crucial to the typhoon recovery.

H.R. 3157 will create a consistent mechanism of communication between the federal government and state and local entities for agricultural issues in the event of a disaster. I strongly support passage of H.R. 3157 and encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this important disaster legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3157, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3157, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

RESOLVING BOUNDARY CONFLICTS IN VICINITY OF MARK TWAIN NATIONAL FOREST IN BARRY AND STONE COUNTIES, MISSOURI

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2304) to resolve boundary conflicts in the vicinity of the Mark Twain National Forest in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri, that resulted from private landowner reliance on a subsequent Federal survey, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2304

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Certain landowners in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri, innocently and in good faith relied on subsequent land surveys, which they believed to be correct, and occupied, improved, or claimed portions of adjoining Federal lands based on such survey information.

(2) The appropriate Federal agencies should undertake actions to correctly reestablish the corners of the Public Land Survey System in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri, and rectify boundary conflicts and landownership claims against Federal lands resulting from subsequent land surveys, and do so in a manner which imposes the least cost and inconvenience to affected private landowners.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to resolve boundary conflicts in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri, arising from subsequent land surveys; and

(2) to minimize costs and inconvenience to the affected private property owners in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri.

SEC. 2. RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY CONFLICTS, VICINITY OF MARK TWAIN NATIONAL FOREST, BARRY AND STONE COUNTIES, MISSOURI.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term ''boundary conflict'' means the situation in which the private claim of ownership to certain lands, based on subsequent land surveys, overlaps or conflicts with Federal ownership of the same lands.

(3) The term ''Federal land surveys'' means any land survey made by any agency or department of the Federal Government using Federal employees, or by Federal contract with State-licensed private land surveyors or corporations and businesses licensed to provide professional land surveying services in the State of Missouri.

(4) The term ''original land surveys'' means the land surveys made by the United States General Land Office as part of the Public Land Survey System in the State of Missouri, and upon which Government land patents were issued conveying the land.

(5) The term ''Public Land Survey System'' means the rectangular system of original Government lands surveys made by the United States General Land Office and its successor, the Bureau of Land Management, under Federal laws providing for the survey of the public lands upon which the original land patents were issued.

(6) The term ''qualifying claimant'' means a private owner of real property in Barry or Stone County, Missouri, who has a boundary conflict as a result of good faith and innocent reliance on subsequent land surveys, and as a result of such reliance, has occupied, improved, or made ownership claims to Federal lands.

(7) The term ''subsequent land surveys'' mean any land surveys made after the original land surveys.

(b) NOTICE OF BOUNDARY CONFLICT.—

(1) SUBMISSION AND CONTENTS.—A qualifying claimant shall notify the appropriate Secretary in writing of a claim that a boundary conflict exists with Federal land administered by the appropriate Secretary. The notice shall be accompanied by the following information, which, except as provided in subsection (d)(2)(B), shall be provided without cost to the United States:

(A) A land survey plat and legal description of the affected Federal lands, which are based upon a land survey completed and certified by a Missouri State-licensed professional land surveyor, and done in conformity with the Public Land Survey System and in compliance with the applicable State and Federal land surveying laws.

(B) Information relating to the claim of ownership of the Federal lands, including supporting documentation showing the landowner relied on a subsequent land survey due to actions by the Federal Government in making or approving surveys for the Table Rock Reservoir.

(2) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION.—To obtain relief under this section, a qualifying claimant shall submit the notice required by paragraph (1) within 15 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CLAIMANTS.—The qualifying claimant shall have the responsibility for establishing that the qualifying claimant qualifies for the remedies provided in subsection (c).

(c) RESOLUTION AUTHORITIES.—The appropriate Secretary may take any of the following actions, or combination of actions, in order to resolve boundary conflicts with qualifying claimants involving lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary:

(1) Convey and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States in land subject to a boundary conflict.

(2) Confirm Federal title to, and retain in Federal management, any land subject to a boundary conflict, if the appropriate Secretary determines there are Federal interests, including improvements, authorized uses, easements, hazardous materials, or historical and cultural resources, on the land that necessitates retention of the land.

(3) Compensate the qualifying claimant for the value of the overlapping property for which title is confirmed and retained in Federal management pursuant to paragraph (2).

(d) CONSIDERATION AND COST.—

(1) CONVEYANCE WITHOUT CONSIDERATION.—The conveyance of land under subsection (c)(1) shall be made without consideration if the appropriate Secretary determines that the boundary conflict was the result of the innocent detrimental reliance by the qualifying claimant on a subsequent land survey.

(2) COSTS.—The appropriate Secretary shall—

(A) pay administrative, personnel, and any other costs associated with the implementation of this section, including the costs of survey, marking, and monumenting property lines and corners; and

(B) reimburse the qualifying claimant for reasonable out-of-pocket survey costs necessary to establish a claim under this section.

(3) VALUATION.—Compensation paid to a qualifying claimant pursuant to subsection (c)(3) for land retained in Federal ownership pursuant to subsection (c)(2) shall be valued on the basis of the contributory value of the tract of land to the larger adjoining private parcel and not on the basis of the land being a separate tract. The appropriate Secretary shall not consider the value of any Federal improvements to the land.

(e) PREEXISTING CONDITIONS; RESERVATIONS; EXISTING RIGHTS AND USES.—

(1) PREEXISTING CONDITIONS.—The appropriate Secretary shall not compensate a qualifying claimant or any other person for any preexisting condition or reduction in value of any land subject to a boundary conflict because of any existing or outstanding permits, use authorizations, reservations, timber removal, or other land use or condition.

(2) EXISTING RESERVATIONS AND RIGHTS AND USES.—Any conveyance pursuant to subsection (c)(1) shall be subject to—

(A) reservations for existing public uses for roads, utilities, and facilities; and

(B) permits, rights-of-way, contracts and any other authorization to use the property.

(3) TREATMENT OF LAND SUBJECT TO SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATION OR PERMIT.—For any land subject to a special use authorization or permit for access or utilities, the appropriate Secretary may convert, at the request of the holder, such authorization to a permanent easement prior to any conveyance pursuant to subsection (c)(1).

(4) FUTURE RESERVATIONS.—The appropriate Secretary may reserve rights for future public uses in a conveyance made pursuant to subsection (c)(1) if the qualifying claimant is compensated for the reservation in cash or in land of equal value.

(f) RELATION TO OTHER CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section affects the

Quiet Title Act (28 U.S.C. 2409a) or other applicable law, or affects the exchange and disposal authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the Small Tracts Act (16 U.S.C. 521c), or the exchange and disposal authorities of the Secretary of the Army.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The appropriate Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (c)(1) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides a mechanism for the Forest Service and the Army Corps of Engineers to resolve boundary conflicts between the Mark Twain National Forest and adjacent private landowners. The dispute over boundaries stems from recent surveys conducted by contractors to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which have subsequently been found severely flawed by the State Surveyor for Missouri.

The measure sets a process for dealing with disputed boundaries. The landowner would notify the Secretary of Agriculture of a disputed boundary, prompting a new land survey. If the Secretary determines that the boundary conflict is the result of a reliance on a previous land survey, the land in dispute can be returned to the property owner.

It is important to note that the bill does not require the conveyance of any particular lands. Where a new survey shows that the lands in question were surveyed improperly, the Forest Service can either execute a quit claim deed, assert Federal ownership if the Federal Government has improved the land, or compensate the landowner for the land.

We made one minor change to the bill which requires that any liability for environmental hazards on the property, if any, be settled through an agreement between the landowner and the Federal Government. This change was requested by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

This is a case where the Federal Government has not exercised adequate due diligence in maintaining their land surveys to the detriment of their neighbors. Rather than redrawing map boundaries from Washington, we are creating a process where these folks can address their claims closer to home. The Committee on Agriculture regards this as an equitable solution to a local problem created by the Federal Government. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2304, legislation to resolve boundary conflicts in the vicinity of the Mark Twain National Forest in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri, resulting from private landowner reliance on a subsequent Federal survey.

These boundary conflicts resulted from discrepancies between recent land surveys conducted by the U.S. Forest Service and its implementation of the Restoration of Original Corners Program, and decades-old surveys conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers. As a result of the more recent land surveys, private property lands adjoining Federal lands were moved, and private property landowners discovered that, due to their reliance on the older land surveys, they had inadvertently trespassed on Federal land.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2304 would remedy these boundary discrepancies by authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey title to U.S. Forest Service land on which private landowners can demonstrate that they inadvertently trespassed because of their reliance on a previous inaccurate Federal survey, or relied on a survey based on a previous inaccurate survey.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in order to resolve these boundary discrepancies.

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

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

This is a commonsense solution at the local level to problems that the Federal Government has created. The Committee on Agriculture strongly supports this bill, and I hope that Members will join us in supporting this bill.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the speedy resolution of a boundary dispute affecting private property owners in my Congressional District.

Apparently, there are some local issues that apparently only an act of Congress can solve.

This issue surfaced when private property owners' historic boundary lines neighboring the Mark Twain National Forest and Table Rock Lake in Missouri's Barry and Stone Counties were blurred when the U.S. Forest Service restored the mid-1800s Corners program.

Over the years, the Forest Service has been effectively shaving off substantial sections of private property that adjoins federal lands. Recent land surveys have found major differences in surveys conducted by the Forest Service and the Army Corps of Engineers. My legislation would resolve these discrepancies, so private property owners don't lose property adjoining Federal lands.

A fight with the Federal Government over a boundary line can be an uphill battle. This bill will maintain the original property lines and hand the title of the disputed land to the private landowner.

The Federal Government already owns a third of the nation's land, and inaccuracies in federally conducted surveys should never force landowners to forfeit their property.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House's approval of this common-sense bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2304, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2304, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for approximately 10 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess for approximately 10 minutes.

□ 1448

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

GEORGE HENRY WHITE POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3353) 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''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3353

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

SECTION 1. GEORGE HENRY WHITE POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 Main Street in Tarboro, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the ''George Henry White Post Office Building''.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased that the House is considering H.R. 3353. This bill names a post office after a great American statesman, George Henry White. From 1897 to 1901, Republican George Henry White served two terms as the U.S. Representative for North Carolina's Second Congressional District. At that time, he was the only African American Member of Congress. As such, not only was Congressman White responsible for his North Carolina constituents, but as the highest-ranking black government official in the Nation he also shouldered the burden of representing the 10 million African Americans at the turn of the century.

Congressman White took principled stands against the racial inequality that was far too prevalent for this time period in American history. His eloquence and temperance toward injustice made him a well-respected Member of Congress, and he is truly worthy of commendation by this body from which he departed more than 100 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation commemorates George Henry White's courageous legacy as the last black Member of this House following Reconstruction. I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) for having his bill considered by the whole House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3353.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we gather this afternoon to honor a great man and leader who blazed trails for African Americans not only in North Carolina but throughout the Nation, Congressman George Henry White from my home State of North Carolina.

I want to express my appreciation for the strong bipartisan support from the North Carolina delegation and the sponsorship of this bill.

We are here today, Mr. Speaker, to show our appreciation for Congressman White by naming the post office after him in Tarboro, North Carolina, the town which he represented; and the County of Edgecombe, which he represented with distinction as a part of the second congressional district, I now have the great privilege of representing that same community, humbly following in his footsteps.

Mr. George Henry White was born in Rosendale, Bladen County, North Carolina, during slavery. He grew up the son of a sharecropper in nearby Columbus County. He was educated at the Whitten School in Lumberton. He first embarked on his trail of excellence when he left his job as a farm laborer and ventured here to the Nation's Capital to attend Howard University. Many people mistake him as being a graduate of Howard Law School, but actually he was a graduate of high school and Howard undergraduate school.

Upon graduation from Howard University in 1877, Mr. White returned to North Carolina settling in the coastal town of New Bern, to begin the fight to better his North Carolina for all families and helping empower the African American community.

He became a teacher and then a principal and is credited with establishing four new schools. Mr. White knew then what we all know now: information is power, and the key to steering one's own course is a quality education.

While living in New Bern, where he also worked as an attorney, having read law to become a lawyer, Mr. White embarked upon a career in public service spanning more than 2 decades when, in 1880, he was elected to the North Carolina House of Representatives.

In 1884 he was elected to the North Carolina State Senate. And in 1886 he was elected as a solicitor for the second judicial district of North Carolina where he served two terms. During this time, George Henry White was the only African American district attorney in the United States. Continuing a political career steeped in innovation and leadership, blazing trails unheard of in his day, in 1894 Mr. White moved to Tarboro. It might be interesting to know that the one reason he moved was because there was redistricting going on and his hometown of New Bern was carved out of the second district. So he just packed up and moved down to Tarboro, North Carolina, his wife's hometown.

Three years later, he would become Congressman White, and only the third African American elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from North Carolina, John Adams Hyman being the first, Henry P. Cheatham the second.

Congressman White was the only African American in the United States Congress during his two terms and was the highest-ranking elected African American in the United States. He essentially represented not only citizens of the second congressional district but all 10 million African Americans across the Nation. He was the last former slave and the last African American to serve in the Congress during the post-Reconstruction era.

He opened doors while in Congress to pave the way for the civil rights movement more than half a century later. He campaigned against racial discrimination and urged enforcement of the second section of the 14th amendment.

In January 1901, his last year in office, Congressman White proposed a bill that would make lynching of African Americans a Federal crime. Unfortunately, this bill did not pass; but it did have some impact in the Deep South in particular. Despite Congressman White's passionate plea, as I indicated, the term ended without his bill passing.

George Henry White's farewell speech on the floor of Congress, often referred to as the ''Phoenix Speech,'' or his farewell speech, was made January 29, 1901: ''This, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the Negroes' temporary farewell to the American Congress; but let me say, Phoenix-like he will rise up some day and come again. These parting words on behalf of an outraged, heartbroken, bruised and bleeding, but God-fearing people, faithful, industrious, loyal, rising people full of potential force.''

Mr. Speaker, while Congressman White is deserving of far greater accolades, and I am sure they will come in time, it is my great pleasure to offer this legislation on his behalf. I urge the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) for introducing this very appropriate bill, and I urge all of our colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 3353.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3353.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES E. DAVIS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1590) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 315 Empire Boulevard in Crown Heights, Brooklyn, New York, as the ''James E. Davis Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1590

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

SECTION 1. JAMES E. DAVIS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Empire Boulevard in Crown Heights, Brooklyn, New York, shall be known as designated

as the ''James E. Davis Post Office Building''.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1590, a bill sponsored by Senator SCHUMER of New York, names a postal facility in Brooklyn, New York, as the James E. Davis Post Office Building. My distinguished colleague on the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), authored the House version of this postal naming bill, H.R. 3012. I commend both the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and Senator SCHUMER for their work on this meaningful effort.

Mr. Speaker, James E. Davis was a devoted public official who lived and worked in Brooklyn all of his life. The son of a corrections officer himself, Davis became an officer in the New York Police Department in 1983. After nearly 2 decades on the police force, he was elected to the New York City Council in November of 2001. In that capacity Davis was able to utilize his dynamic public speaking ability. He truly had a gift for connecting with audiences and delivering messages that advocated non-violence.

Mr. Speaker, defeating crime and eliminating violence in inner-city New York were lifelong missions for James E. Davis both as a law enforcement and elected official. This reality made July 23, 2003, an even more ironically tragic day for New Yorkers as well as all Americans. On that afternoon, James Davis had invited a political rival to City Hall to attend a council meeting. Just after 2 o'clock, Councilman Davis' guest brandished a handgun and inexplicably shot Davis twice in the chest. Mr. Davis sadly passed away at a nearby hospital later that afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, many of us saw the story of James E. Davis' tragic murder in New York City Hall on national newscasts last summer. I want to join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and Senator SCHUMER in extending the sympathy of all Members of Congress to the family, friends, and supporters of James E. Davis. I am pleased that passage of this legislation will immortalize James E. Davis' contributions to his community and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of S. 1590.

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

□ 1500

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand at this time as the designee for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) on behalf of this resolution. I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of S. 1590, legislation naming a postal facility after the late James E. Davis.

S. 1509, which was introduced by Senator SCHUMER on September 8, 2003, was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Government Reform on November 6, 2003. An identical bill, H.R. 3012, sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) has the support and cosponsorship of the entire New York delegation.

Mr. James Davis was born in 1962 and graduated from Tilden High School in Brooklyn, New York in 1980. He obtained a degree from Pace University in 1989 and then joined the New York City Correctional Department. He became a police officer in 1991 and was assigned to the 73rd Precinct in Brooklyn. A youth officer, Mr. DAVIS served in the New York Police Department until he decided to enter the political arena in 1988 by running for assemblyman for the 43rd District. Although unsuccessful, he ran again and won office in November 2001, where he served as councilman for the 35th District.

Tragically, as we have just heard, Councilman Davis's life was cut short when he was gunned down in a violent shooting in the City Hall at the young age of 41.

Mr. Speaker, James Davis was a man of the community. He has dedicated his life to improving conditions in Brooklyn, New York, helping young people realize their dreams and stopping urban violence.

I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and Senator SCHUMER for seeking to honor the legacy of Councilmember James Davis and urge the adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I urge passage of S. 1590, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this very worthwhile and appropriate measure.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, as the lead sponsor of the House version of S. 1590, I am pleased that we are considering this legislation today. S. 1590 would rename the post office located at 315 Empire Boulevard in Crown Heights, Brooklyn, New York, as the "James E. Davis Post Office Building." I would also like to note that this bill has been cosponsored by the entire New York delegation, and I would like to thank my colleagues from New York for doing so.

On that tragic day when Councilman James Davis of Brooklyn was murdered in a violent shooting in City Hall, New York City, we lost a true public servant. He was an intelligent, passionate, and energetic young man who had an extremely bright future. He worked very hard and took his duties as a public servant very, very seriously. He was only 41 years old and had served almost one term in the New York City Council. But he had already made his mark.

I met James through the Youth March Against Violence that he organized. His commitment to this issue was genuine.

However, when I think of him, I remember one of the last conversations we had, which I think really embodies his approach to public service. We were meeting with housing authority officials, and he told them we weren't there to point fingers at every one. But if we didn't work together to get thing done, we would all take the blame. Sound advice that I think all public officials should take to heart.

With James, it was always about the community. He was dedicated to its betterment, having served as a police officer and district leader before being elected to the city council. One could always see the love he had for his neighbors and constituents. Naming a post office after him would be a lasting tribute to all of his hard work for the community that he loved so much. While we still have a heavy heart for losing such a good friend, the James E. Davis post office can help us celebrate his life. I think I can speak for all of Brooklyn when I say that the James E. Davis post office is something that we will all be proud of.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1590.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGH GREGG POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3185) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 38 Spring Street in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the ''Hugh Gregg Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3185

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

SECTION 1. HUGH GREGG POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 38 Spring Street in Nashua, New Hampshire, shall be known and designated as the ''Hugh Gregg Post Office Building''.

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

be a reference to the Hugh Gregg Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3185.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to call up H.R. 3185 for consideration. This legislation introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) designates the postal facility at 38 Spring Street in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the Hugh Gregg Post Office Building.

Hugh Gregg, a giant in New Hampshire politics for several decades, was elected Governor of the Granite State in 1953 at the age of 34. As a result, he was forevermore nicknamed the ''Boy Governor.'' One of his most notable achievements was his work in organizing the first-in-the-Nation Presidential primary in New Hampshire. What began as little more than a beauty contest for candidates in 1952, his tireless work is a big reason the New Hampshire primary has evolved into such a critical date for modern Presidential candidates.

It is also important to note that Governor Gregg's son, Judd, went on to be elected Governor of New Hampshire in 1989, and he now serves as the State's senior United States Senator.

Mr. Speaker, America mourned on September 24th of this year, when Hugh Gregg passed away at age 85. He is survived by his wife, Catherine Warner Gregg, two sons, five grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) for his work on H.R. 3185, and I strongly support its passage.

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

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

I am honored and pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 3185, legislation naming a postal facility after Hugh Gregg. H.R. 3185 which was introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) on September 25, 2003, was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Reform on October 8, 2003.

H.R. 3185 has the support and cosponsorship of the entire New Hampshire Congressional delegation. Hugh Gregg, a former Republican Governor of New Hampshire from 1953 until 1955, was born in New Hampshire and became its youngest Governor at the age of 34. A graduate of Yale and Harvard Law School, he served as a Special Agent of the Counterintelligence Corps during World War II and the Korean Crisis.

A well-known businessman and community leader, Mr. Gregg passed away on September 24, 2003 at the age of 85. Hugh Gregg was remembered as a statesman and gentleman. His love for his State and country and dedication to public service was well known.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for seeking to honor the late Hugh Gregg and urge swift adoption on H.R. 3185.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the author of the bill.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for recognizing me and for making it possible along with my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) to have the opportunity to bring this bill to the floor.

As the gentleman said at the end of his speech just previously, Governor Hugh Gregg died on September 24th of this year after a brief illness, and brief it was, because just prior to that illness, the city of Nashua, which is the largest city in my district, celebrated its 150th anniversary. And guess who walked at the front of the line in a top hat and tuxedo with a cane but Hugh Gregg, the grand marshall of the parade. Governor Hugh Gregg celebrating the city that he loved and lived in his entire life.

Indeed, he served our country during World War II, not once, but twice. He served in the Korean War. He served on the Nashua City Council. He became its mayor, and he was elected Governor of the State of New Hampshire in his early thirties, the year I was born.

Hugh Gregg also took on big projects. He was not one to think about things pragmatically or think about things in any small way.

During my political career, he achieved two major accomplishments. First, he sought out to establish a museum of political history in New Hampshire. It is no secret that New Hampshire is the first part of the Nation's primary and always will be. Hugh Gregg wanted to make sure that the political history of the State, going back as far as anybody cared to, was properly recorded. And as time went on, candidates running for office would have a place to repose their memorabilia and great events and so forth. He published no less than three books on the subject of New Hampshire political history, the latest with our Secretary of State, Bill Gardner. Hugh Gregg is responsible for the establishment of this institution, which will live on in perpetuity.

The second big project he took on was an effort to try to prove that New Hampshire was the birthplace of the Republican party and not Ripon, Wisconsin, as it has been previously thought. No offense to our distinguished presiding officer here today, but he turned out to be right about that. He made extensive research and determined that the records of the party originated in Exeter, New Hampshire, and he established a society called the Amos Tuck Society.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Hugh Gregg was not only Governor, mayor of Nashua, father of U.S. Senator JUDD GREGG and Cy Gregg, long-time husband of Catherine Gregg, a great political crusader for many different causes, not all of which were necessarily associated with Republicans, but were really focussed on the good of the State of New Hampshire and the good of the lives of the people around him. The efforts he made on behalf of others, not only in the area of politics, but in charity through the Crotched Mountain Rehabilitation Center which is one of the Nation's leading centers for the treatment of those brain-injured and developmentally-disabled individuals established by his father but nurtured and expanded significantly by him.

He served on a number of different boards, serving on the board of the Fleet Bank, at that time Indian Head Bank. He was involved in businesses all over the place.

Hugh Gregg was a man of courage. He was a man that some might say was tactless on occasion. I know, as Governor of the State of New Hampshire, on a couple of occasions he was known to become frustrated with people he came in contact with, and he had a habit of taking scissors and snipping their ties off just to get their attention and, indeed, it did.

Hugh Gregg campaigned with me during one of my many campaigns in the Nashua Recycling Center. We were trying to meet people there, of course. He was in his early eighties or late seventies. He said, You go over there and work over there in recycling, where they bring in bottles and cans. That is a nice clean thing for you to do. I will go over and carry the garbage because nobody is going to tell a 75-year-old man that they do not like him for carrying their garbage over to the garbage area.

Hugh Gregg was the kind of man that was full of energy, full of enthusiasm and full of compassion and a commitment to the folks around him in the city of Nashua and the State of New Hampshire. He will be sorely missed by all of us. I think this is a wonderful opportunity to name the Nashua Post Office after this great American citizen.

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

Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) has brought up the founding of the Republican party and Mr. Gregg's interest in that, I would mention that I have the privilege of representing the only district in the United States that has had

continuous Republican representation in the United States House of Representatives since the founding of the Republican party.

This legislation seems to be very fitting and proper to name this post office facility after Hugh Gregg who was a very great American, who saw the American dream come true in his life in several different ways. I urge passage of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3185.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING INSPECTORS GENERAL FOR EFFORTS DURING PAST 25 YEARS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) commending the Inspectors General for their efforts to prevent and detect waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement, and to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the Federal Government during the past 25 years.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 18

Whereas the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) was signed into law on October 12, 1978, with overwhelming bipartisan support;

Whereas Inspectors General now exist in the 29 largest executive branch agencies and in 28 other designated Federal entities;

Whereas Inspectors General work to serve the American taxpayer by promoting economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity in the administration of the programs and operations of the Federal Government;

Whereas Inspectors General conduct audits and investigations to both prevent and detect waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the programs and operations of the Federal Government;

Whereas Inspectors General make Congress and agency heads aware, through semiannual reports and other communications, of problems and deficiencies in the administration of programs and operations of the Federal Government;

Whereas Congress and agency heads utilize the recommendations of Inspectors General in the development and implementation of policies that promote economy and efficiency in the administration of, or prevent and detect waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in, the programs and operations of the Federal Government;

Whereas Federal employees and other dedicated citizens report information to Inspectors General regarding the possible existence of an activity constituting a violation of law, rules, or regulations, or mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety;

Whereas Inspector General audits and investigations result in annual recommendations for more effective spending of billions of taxpayer dollars, thousands of successful criminal prosecutions, hundreds of millions of dollars returned to the United States Treasury through investigative recoveries, and the suspension and debarment of thousands of individuals or entities from doing business with the Government; and

Whereas for 25 years the Inspectors General have worked with Congress to facilitate effective oversight to improve the programs and operations of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) recognizes the many accomplishments of the Inspectors General in preventing and detecting waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the Federal Government;

(2) commends the Inspectors General and their employees for the dedication and professionalism displayed in the performance of their duties; and

(3) reaffirms the role of Inspectors General in promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of the programs and operations of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S.J. Res. 18.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 18 commends Inspectors General across the Federal Government for their contributions to taxpayers and overall government efficiency over the last 25 years.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the Inspector General Act of 1978 that created the position of Inspector General in Federal agencies and departments. I had the honor of introducing the original legislation to name an Inspector General or create an Inspector General position for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Today, Inspectors General exist in 57 executive branch agencies. Their work has eliminated waste in management at all levels of the Federal Government and saved countless taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this body has already passed the House version of this resolution, so I will similarly urge all Members to support the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 18.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Joint Resolution 18 which recognizes Inspectors General for their efforts to prevent waste, fraud and abuse over the past 25 years. In fact, as has been just pointed out, the House passed H.J. Res. 70 by voice just a few days ago.

Twenty-five years ago the Inspector General Act of 1978 established, for the first time, IG's in 12 executive branch agencies. They proved so successful that today there are IG's in 59 Federal agencies. The Inspectors General report both to the agency head and to Congress and are one of Congress's principal watchdogs in the executive branch.

□ 1515

IGs have a tough job. As independent investigators within Federal agencies, they are often the last person a manager wants to hear from.

The IGs returned over $4.5 billion to the Federal Government during fiscal year 2002 in restitutions and recoveries. IG audits also identified another $72 billion in funds that could be used more efficiently and effectively. They also had more than 10,000 successful criminal prosecutions.

The IGs make similar contributions year after year. They have more than proven their usefulness to Congress and the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating their 25th anniversary.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close by saying that many, many people have paid lip service to waste, fraud, and abuse within the Federal Government, but these Inspectors General and their staffs are on the front lines trying to do something about this to save taxpayers money and help make our Federal Government run more honestly and efficiently, so I urge passage of this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 18.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING MR. SARGENT SHRIVER

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 299) honoring Mr. Sargent Shriver for his dedication and service to the United States of America, for his service in

the United States Navy, and for his lifetime of work as an ambassador for the poor and powerless citizens of the United States of America, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 299

Whereas from 1955 to 1960, Mr. Shriver served as president of the Chicago Board of Education;

Whereas Mr. Shriver earned the rank of Lieutenant Commander after 5 years of service in the United States Navy;

Whereas in 1960, Mr. Shriver began his career in public service by working as a political and organization coordinator for Senator John F. Kennedy in the Wisconsin and West Virginia Presidential primaries;

Whereas from 1961 to 1966, Mr. Shriver organized and directed the Peace Corps, developing volunteer activities in Africa, Asia, and Latin America;

Whereas from 1964 to 1968, as the first Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity during President Lyndon B. Johnson's administration, Mr. Shriver helped establish Head Start, VISTA, Community Action, Job Corps, Legal Services, Foster Grandparents, Indian and Migrant Opportunities, and Neighborhood Health Services;

Whereas in 1964, Mr. Shriver was appointed by President Johnson to serve as United States Ambassador to France;

Whereas in 1972, Mr. Shriver was selected by the Democratic party as the Vice Presidential candidate during Senator George McGovern's Presidential campaign against President Nixon;

Whereas in 1984, Mr. Shriver served as president of the Board of Directors of Special Olympics and was responsible for the operation and international development of sports programs around the world;

Whereas in 1990, Mr. Shriver was appointed chairman of the Board of Special Olympics;

Whereas in 2003, Mr. Shriver was appointed chairman of the Board Emeritus of Special Olympics and has held positions in many associations, including the American Council on Germany, the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry, the Navy League, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Knights of Columbus;

Whereas Mr. Shriver has been honored with numerous awards, including the Distinguished American Award from the John F. Kennedy Library and Foundation for his work with the Peace Corps and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the United States' highest civilian honor; and

Whereas Mr. Shriver has been honored with more than 24 honorary degrees from universities around the world, including Yale University, Brandeis University, Boston College, Yeshiva University, the University of Liberia, and Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok, Thailand: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) honors Mr. Sargent Shriver for his dedication and service to the United States of America, for his service in the United States Navy, and for his lifetime of work acting as an ambassador for the poor and powerless citizens of the United States; and

(2) recognizes Mr. Sargent Shriver for his steadfast dedication and lifelong service to his country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 299, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 299 honors Mr. Sargent Shriver for his dedication and service to the United States of America. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy appointed Sargent Shriver the first director of the United States Peace Corps, an organization that continues to help millions of people all over the globe today. Three years later, because of his success establishing the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver was also named director of the Office of Economic Opportunity by President Lyndon Johnson. He ultimately resigned from the Peace Corps in 1966 to devote himself full time to the OEO. In 1968, he was selected as our Ambassador to France. Ambassador Shriver joined the national Presidential ticket in 1972, when he became George McGovern's Vice Presidential running mate in that year.

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver lived a remarkable life committed to public service in the U.S. and around the world. I congratulate the gentleman from California for recognizing Mr. Sargent Shriver for his steadfast dedication and lifelong service to his country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver is a humanitarian, an advocate, a public servant, and a leader whose contributions to his country and his fellow man are immeasurable. Leading President Johnson's War on Poverty, Shriver ushered in many of the great society programs aimed at helping Americans better their lives. A list of programs Sargent Shriver started, defended, and expanded, and which remain in place today, are the Peace Corps, which in 1961 he helped organize and became its first director, Head Start, Job Corps, Legal Services, Upward Bound, Community Action, Foster Grandparents, and VISTA. Along with his wife Eunice, the founder of Special Olympics International, Sargent Shriver has nurtured the Special Olympics since 1968.

A man of stellar character and tireless energy, Shriver was raised on a farm in Westminster, Maryland. He worked his way through college, graduating from Yale University, cum laude, in 1938, and Yale Law School in 1941. Shriver served 5 years in the Navy during World War II ending his service as Lieutenant Commander.

Sargent Shriver worked to unite common concerns of the citizens of America and of the world. In 2001, during a speech at the 40th Anniversary of the Peace Corps Vigil at the Lincoln Memorial, Shriver stated: ''Be servants of peace; work at home as you have worked abroad, humbly, persistently, intelligently. Weep with those who are sorrowful, care for those who are sick. Serve your wives, serve your husbands, serve your families, serve your neighbors, serve your citizens, serve your cities, serve the poor. Join others who serve. Serve, serve, serve. That's the end. That is the challenge. For in the end, it will be the servants who save us all.''

Be servants of peace. This is an important directive not only for the Peace Corps, but for all of us who work to seek to make America and the world a better place, as Sargent Shriver has. We owe men and women like Sargent Shriver a debt of gratitude and this resolution serves to do that.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 299, honoring the life and accomplishments of my friend Sargent Shriver. I have another good friend here that I met on the Hill, that I have known for a number of years, who worked many years ago for Sargent Shriver, considered him a mentor, and is one that really got me interested in studying more about what Sargent Shriver has accomplished in this life. Just a short week after his 88th birthday, we honor this American Patriot for his accomplishments in life, for his compassion for humanity, for his philanthropy, for his generosity, and for his commitment to public service.

As children, we all have visions and dreams of one day being able to change the world, to make a real difference to mankind, to be remembered. But in reality, it is difficult to find a person who has actually done so. As an ambassador and advocate for the poor and powerless, as a man of strong conviction, faith, and devotion, as a man who genuinely loves his country and all that it stands for, it is safe to say that Sargent Shriver truly has made a difference in the world.

Born 88 years ago last Sunday, Sargent received both his undergraduate and law degrees from Yale University. He married his long-time sweetheart, Eunice Kennedy, and 50 years later, their love remains as strong as the day they met. His devotion to his wife and his five children, throughout his life, exemplify his character and represent the true American spirit.

His love for family is followed closely by his love of country. As an international lawyer and administrator, Sargent Shriver has compiled an unparalleled record of public service at

every tier, from the local level to the world community. Sargent served as an attorney in the United States Navy during World War II and retired as a Lieutenant Commander after 5 years of service.

After ending his military career, Mr. Shriver worked briefly as an editorial assistant at Newsweek magazine. In 1955, he began a 5-year tenure as president of the Chicago Board of Education, a position that would teach him the sense of patriotism and community activism, which he would carry throughout his life.

In 1961, Mr. Shriver answered the call of duty again, this time by President John F. Kennedy. Sargent established and directed the newly-founded organization called the Peace Corps, and helped organize operations around the world, from Africa and Asia to Latin America. The Peace Corps would eventually come to the aid of foreign communities needing medical, educational and technical assistance, while giving millions of Americans the opportunity share our culture and values and democratic way of life to those less fortunate around the world.

After September 11, many Americans have been searching for their role in the war against terrorism, asking what can I do. President Bush has called on every citizen to devote a portion of their lives to service. Since September 2001, more than 3,000 potential Peace Corps volunteers have started applications and almost 7,000 men and women have contacted the Peace Corps to ask about volunteering. The Peace Corps estimates that there has been a 300 percent increase in volunteer interest. Sargent Shriver deserves the gratitude of every American for his contributions to this most noble of causes.

As the true patriot he is, Sargent's commitment to those in need did not stop there. He served as the first director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under President Johnson. Using his principles as his guiding light, Sargent played the American Dream a reality for millions of Americans across America. And, today, at the young age of 88, Sargent's mission of service continues. He was elected president of the Special Olympics in 1984 and was appointed Chairman of the Board Emeritus of Special Olympics earlier this year.

Martin Luther King said, ''You ought to believe in something in life, and believe that thing so fervently that you will stand up for it until the end of your days.'' As a man of unflinching moral character, visionary leadership, and a compassion that sees no end, Sargent Shriver embodies the idealism that helped make the United States the world's cornerstone of freedom, opportunity, and democracy.

Mr. Shriver once said that the politics of life is personal initiative, creativity, experience, and grace. Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver exemplifies the American spirit which represents the very best in humanity. His life is a celebration of democracy. I am proud to have sponsored this resolution and encourage all Members to follow the example set by my friend, Sargent Shriver.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to commend the gentleman from California for introducing this very worthwhile legislation, and I join him in commending Sargent Shriver on his career. He has led a life of public service that has set a great example for everyone in this Nation. He has tried to serve this Nation well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in honoring Sargent Shriver for his years of outstanding service to our country. As a lawyer, government administrator, ambassador, and passionate spokesman for the poor, Mr. Shriver has devoted his life to the most vulnerable among us.

Sargent Shriver is perhaps best known as the founder and first administrator of President John F. Kennedy's Peace Corps. In that position, Mr. Shriver organized Peace Corps operations in more than 50 countries in the developing world.

After founding the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver dedicated himself to President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society. Within the Great Society, Mr. Shriver founded Head Start; he created the Job Corps; he organized Legal Services; and he created Volunteers in Service to America.

In time, Mr. Shriver's service to our country took on a diplomatic perspective when he went to Paris as our ambassador to France under both President Johnson and President Richard M. Nixon.

Upon his return from Paris, Mr. Shriver threw himself into Democratic politics. During the 1970 election, he traveled the country on behalf of Democratic House and Senate candidates. And then in 1972 he was the Democratic nominee for vice president joining the ticket with my good friend George McGovern. In 1976, Mr. Shriver ran in the Democratic presidential primaries.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Mr. Shriver devoted himself to philanthropic causes. Among other things, he served on the Rockefeller University Council; he was elected president of the Special Olympics; he was later appointed Chairman of the Board of Special Olympics, Inc. Mr. Shriver went on to receive numerous awards and honorary degrees from colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, this summer I had the opportunity to see and talk with Sargent Shriver in Massachusetts. He shared with me his dreams of a peaceful world and his hopes for a brighter future. And he looks great.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor Mr. Shriver today, I believe it is important that we reflect on his life of service to our country and how we can learn from him. In a letter he composed about his fight with Alzheimer's disease, he wrote of the challenges we face as a country ''to search for the pathways to peace . . . to overcome the horrors of poverty and neglect in this country and around the world. Indeed, Mr. Shriver's words should guide us each day.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in honoring Mr. Shriver for his decades of selfless service to our country and the world community.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in 5 days, we will observe the 40th anniversary of one of the darkest moments in American history—the assassination of our 35th President, John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy stirred the imagination of our Nation and inspired a generation to ''ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.''

Today, Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring a man who answered that clarion call to a life in public service; a man who quite literally was a pillar in President Kennedy's New Frontier; and a man who is one of the greatest public servants in the history of our Nation.

I, of course, am referring to Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., who celebrated his 88th birthday one week ago.

Sargent Shriver's devotion to this nation—and humanity—sets an example for all to emulate and a high bar that only a few will ever hope to exceed.

A native of the State of Maryland, and in fact a member of one of the Free State's founding families, Sargent Shriver has dedicated his life to improving the lives of others.

A few years ago, Sarge was asked to explain his lifelong commitment to public service. ''I just feel my faith,'' he said. ''A life of service is like catching a disease. In a family it's passed on. . . . Our five children are all involved in service. It's in their veins.''

There is no doubt that this generation and future generations of Americans are the beneficiaries of his life of service.

After graduating from Yale Law School in 1941, Sarge enlisted in the Navy, where he received the Navy Unit Citation and the Submarine Medal for service in both the Atlantic and Pacific.

After World War II, Sarge accepted a position as assistant editor with Newsweek magazine. He later went into business with Joseph Kennedy, President Kennedy's father, and met Eunice, his wife of more than 50 years.

Sarge than moved his family to Chicago, where he served on the Board of Education. In 1956, he was elected President of the Board, the youngest person to serve in such a position in any major American city.

And in 1960, he joined the Presidential campaign of then-Senator Kennedy. After the election, he was asked by President Kennedy to create the Peace Corps and in March 1961 was appointed its founding Director.

Sarge's vision for the Peace Corps was straight-forward and strong: ''to permit Americans to participate directly, personally, and effectively in this struggle for human dignity.''

In nearly 6 years at the Peace Corps, Sarge developed programs in 55 countries with more than 14,500 volunteers. Forty-two years later, the solid foundation that he created has only strengthened and expanded. Today, 163,000 Peace Corps volunteers have served in 135 countries.

However, while Sarge is rightly identified as the founding father of this great American idea, his contributions to the Peace Corps do not tell the whole story.

Sarge also served as the first Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under President Johnson. Then, between 1964 and 1968, he created VISTA, Head Start, Community Action, Foster Grandparents, Job Corps, Legal Services, Indian and Migrant Opportunities and Neighborhood Health Services.

And, then, from 1968 to 1970, he served as U.S. Ambassador to France, before being

nominated in 1972 to serve as the Vice Presidential candidate on the Democratic Party's ticket with George McGovern.

Few Americans have given so much to help so many. Yet, in the twilight of this incredible life, Sarge and Eunice continue to give.

To call this record of public service exemplary is a vast understatement. Words cannot adequately convey the decency and humanity that has been brought into the lives of millions worldwide through the work of Sargent Shriver—international lawyer, ambassador, humanitarian. His life's work shall live on long after this and succeeding generations have passed the torch of public service to their progeny.

''Serve, serve, serve,'' Sarge was know to say, ''because in the end it is the servants who save us all.''

Mr. Speaker, today, I honor a great American and wish him only the best, and I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this Resolution recognizing Sargent Shriver.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 299.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

WALTER F. EHRNFELT, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3300) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15500 Pearl Road in Strongsville, Ohio, as the ''Walter F. Ehrnfelt, Jr. Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3300

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

SECTION 1. WALTER F. EHRNFELT, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15500 Pearl Road in Strongsville, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''Walter F. Ehrnfelt, Jr. Post Office Building''.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3300, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3300, introduced by another of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), designates the postal facility in Strongsville, Ohio, as the Walter F. Ehrnfelt, Jr. Post Office Building. All Members of the Ohio delegation have signed on as cosponsors to this legislation.

Walter Ehrnfelt served as Mayor of Strongsville, Ohio, for 25 years, and he was a civic and social institution in this northern Ohio community outside of Cleveland for even longer than that.

□ 1530

He was reelected six times after first being appointed as mayor in 1978. The town of Strongsville nearly doubled its population during Mayor Ehrnfelt's tenure. Largely due to the mayor's efforts over the years, Strongsville boasts a fantastic school system, a productive industrial base, and many safe and wonderful neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Ehrnfelt sadly passed away in office after suffering a heart attack on May 25 of this year. Naming this post office after Mayor Ehrnfelt in the city he governed and loved would be a small, but very deserved, tribute to his leadership. I urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 3300. I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for working to honor Mr. Walter Ehrnfelt.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in support of H.R. 3300, sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Walter Ehrnfelt, Jr., was first elected mayor of Strongsville, Ohio, in 1978. He was elected for six 4-year terms until his death on May 25, 2003. He was a devoted family man, public servant, and businessman. He served the citizens of Strongsville in many capacities. He was a member of the Strongsville school board, and was later elected president of the board and served as county councilman prior to being elected mayor. In addition to holding positions in many civic organizations, he was an honorary trustee of the Strongsville Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Strongsville United Methodist Church.

I am honored to join my colleagues seeking to honor the many contributions of Walter Ehrnfelt, and I urge swift passage of H.R. 3300.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I feel honored today to support H.R. 3300, a bill to rename the United States Post Office in Strongsville, OH in tribute to the city's distinguished and dedicated former mayor and my friend, the late Walter F. Ehrnfelt. I would also like to extend special thanks to my colleague, Congressman LATOURETTE, for helping to bring his legislation to the floor, along with all of the Ohio delegation for co-sponsoring this bill.

Mayor Ehrnfelt's impact on the city of Strongsville will never be forgotten. After graduating from Strongsville High School, he began what would become a lifetime commitment to civic involvement. In 1973, while running Ehrnfelt Meats, a family business that operates still today, his neighbors convinced him to run for the Strongsville School Board, leading the fight against a campaign to dismiss teachers and ban books in the school district. He won that race, and in 1978 he was appointed mayor of Strongsville, later winning his first mayoral race in November 1979 by more than a 2 to 1 margin. Voters rewarded his effective leadership by re-electing him to six consecutive 4-year terms, the last beginning in 2000.

As mayor, Walter Ehrnfelt guided Strongsville through an unprecedented period of growth, evolving from a community of 22,000 to a thriving suburb of 45,000 residents. He served on Governor Taft's State and Local Government Commission and was president of the Ohio Municipal League. But most importantly, Mayor Ehrnfelt lived each day with the people of Strongsville close to his heart, truly living his life for the betterment of others.

I'm pleased we have the opportunity to honor Mayor Ehrnfelt for his service and spirit today. The people of Strongsville, the state of Ohio, and everyone who knew him will miss him greatly.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this very fitting and proper legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3300.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 3198) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3198

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''John F. Kennedy Center Reauthorization Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 13 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76r) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND SECURITY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Board to carry out section 4(a)(1)(H)—

''(1) $17,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(2) $18,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

''(b) CAPITAL PROJECTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Board to carry out subparagraphs (F) and (G) of section 4(a)(1)—

''(1) $16,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(2) $18,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 and 2006.''.

SEC. 3. JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER PLAZA.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 12(b) of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76q–1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) PROJECT TEAM.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—To further construction of the Project, the Secretary shall establish a Project Team.

''(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The Protect Team shall be composed of the following members:

''(i) The Secretary (or the Secretary's designee).

''(ii) The Administrator of General Services (or the Administrator's designee).

''(iii) The Chairman of the Board (or the Chairman's designee).

''(iv) Such other individuals as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(C) PROJECT DIRECTOR.—The Project Team shall have a Project Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Chairman of the Board. The Project Director shall report directly to the Project Team.''.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 12(c)(1) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 76q–1(c)(1)) is amended by inserting '', in consultation with the Project Team,'' after ''The Board''.

(2) CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS.—Section 12(c)(3) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 76q–1(c)(3)) is amended by inserting '', in consultation with the Project Team,'' after ''The Board''.

(3) APPROVAL BY PROJECT TEAM.—Section 12(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 76q–1(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) APPROVAL BY PROJECT TEAM.—Notwithstanding section 5(e), any decision by the Board that will significantly affect the scope, cost, schedule, or engineering feasibility of any element of the Project, other than buildings to be constructed on the Plaza, shall be subject to the approval of the Project Team.''.

(c) GAO REVIEW.—Section 12 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 76q–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) GAO REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Until completion of the Project, the Comptroller General shall review the management and oversight of construction of the Project by the Board and report periodically on the results of the review to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

''(2) OBJECTIVES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall assess the progress made by the Board in achieving each of the following objectives:

''(A) Development and implementation of adequate policies and procedures to guide the planning and management of the Project.

''(B) Receipt of timely construction data on schedules and costs related to the Project.

''(C) Improvement of human capital resources and expertise in managing construction of the Project.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3198 reauthorizes the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts for 3 years, authorizing funding for its capital repair and maintenance, allows for the GAO review of ongoing construction projects, and creates a new mechanism to ensure effective project oversight.

This bill is the product of a thorough legislative process. The subcommittee held an oversight hearing that included the GAO and the Kennedy Center, reviewed their comprehensive building plan and capital program, and discussed options for improving upon their programs. This process resulted in the bipartisan legislation we are bringing to the floor this afternoon.

I would like to recognize and congratulate the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), as well as full committee chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for their hard work in developing this legislation.

Since its founding, the Kennedy Center has become one of the world's premier entertainment venues, featuring award-winning theater, opera, and symphony performances. The funds we are authorizing today will go solely towards the upkeep and maintenance of the facility, for such repairs as elevator upgrades, handicap accessibility, enhanced fire and life safety equipment, and improved security systems. These repairs are in line with a comprehensive building plan maintained by the Kennedy Center and created at the direction of Congress in 1994. This legislation also incorporates several provisions that ensure effective project oversight.

It is no secret that there are Federal construction projects that have gone beyond their original budget, beyond schedule, and well beyond their original scope. Oftentimes it is the lack of adequate project management and oversight that allow this type of growth. That was the finding of a GAO report requested by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on the Kennedy Center's garage expansion project.

The provision in this bill, including the creation of a project team, the requirement of a project director, and enhanced oversight by the GAO, should prevent such problems as the Kennedy Center goes forward with the construction of a new plaza and two new buildings. However, this reauthorization does not include any money for the plaza project. All of the funding authorized in this bill will be used for the existing structure and its surroundings. By supporting the regular maintenance and upkeep of the Kennedy Center, we will ensure that the center will continue to be a world-class venue well into the future. I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3198, a bill to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Almost a decade ago, the Committee on Public Works, recognizing the inefficiency of years of divided responsibility for the operations, maintenance, and capital repairs of the Kennedy Center, passed H.R. 3567, which gave the board of trustees of the Kennedy Center centralized responsibilities for these matters.

In an effort to prevent continued deterioration of this landmark structure and Presidential memorial, the board asked for and received authority to maintain and improve the center. Former presidents Wolfensohn and Wilker, along with the current president, Michael Kaiser, continually worked to identify and put in place a capital improvement program to enhance the building. They believed it was of the utmost importance that the Kennedy Center management have the responsible and accountability for the building as well as its performing arts and education activities.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's interest then, as it is now, focuses on the use of appropriated funds for the capital improvement program and the repair and alteration of this Presidential memorial. To avoid the previous situation of unmet building needs and delayed repair, the center is now required to submit a 5-year capital plan to the committee. H.R. 3198 authorizes $53 million over 3 years for routine repair and alteration and $52 million for capital projects.

To address improved management for the plaza project, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation, our former colleague, Norman Mineta, to establish a project team and appoint a

project director. The president of the Kennedy Center and the administrator of General Services will serve on the team. The plaza project, when completed, will change the face of Washington in the West End. It is a monumental project that will not only enhance our Nation's Capital, but also provide safer and easier access to the center for patrons, visitors, and tourists. The center, under the leadership of Michael Kaiser, is working diligently to address general management of the facility as well as unmet personal needs. I support H.R. 3198 and urge its passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for H.R. 3198, "The John F. Kennedy Center Reauthorization Act of 2003."

The Kennedy Center serves an important role in our Nation. Not only is it one of the most active theaters in the world, hosting millions of patrons each year to its seven stages, but is also one of the most recognizable theater buildings.

The legislation we are considering this afternoon, which I have offered with my colleagues Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Ms. HOLMES-NORTON, reauthorizes the Capital Infrastructure program of the Kennedy Center for an additional three years. The bill also makes a number of important changes that will improve the management of large construction projects at the Kennedy Center.

This legislation will help ensure that the Kennedy Center continues to have a world class facility to house world class entertainment, which includes everything from classical opera to cutting edge films.

In addition to authorizing funds for maintenance, repair, and security as well as other capital projects, this legislation puts into place important tools for improved project management.

The legislation creates a project team for the plaza project. This team will include the secretary of transportation, administrator of general services, and chairman of the board of trustees of The Kennedy Center. This team will be responsible for overseeing all aspects of the plaza project through a project director, who reports to the project team and is appointed by the Secretary of Transportation.

The legislation also provides for ongoing review by the General Accounting Office of the plaza project until its completion, with periodic reporting to the Congress. The GAO will be looking at the personnel, policies and procedures used to carry out the project.

I support The Kennedy Center Reauthorization and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3198.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO FRESNO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, OF EXISTING FEDERAL COURTHOUSE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1274) to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to Fresno County, California, the existing Federal courthouse in that county, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1274

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

[SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE TO FRESNO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

[On completion of a new Federal courthouse in Fresno, California, the Administrator of General Services shall convey to Fresno County, California, without consideration, the existing Federal courthouse in that county.]

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF B.F. SISK FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of General Services may convey to Fresno County, California, for nominal consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the building and site located at 1130 O Street in Fresno, California, known as the B.F. Sisk Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

(b) TIMING OF CONVEYANCE.—The Administrator may make the conveyance under subsection (a) only after the completion of construction of a new Federal courthouse in Fresno County and the relocation of the tenants in the building referred to in subsection (a) to the new Federal courthouse.

(c) RESTRICTIONS ON USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The deed for the conveyance under subsection (a) shall include a covenant that provides that the property will be used for public use purposes, and specifically provides for substantial use of the property for the administration of justice.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Administrator determines that the property is not being used for the purposes described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert to the United States, at the option of the United States.

(3) EXPIRATION.—The reversionary interest of the United States in the property under this subsection shall expire 20 years after the date of the conveyance.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—This section is not subject to the provisions of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1274, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), allows the administrator of General Services to convey the B.F. Sisk United States Courthouse located in Fresno, California, to Fresno County. This is a worthwhile endeavor, as the GSA is currently constructing a new Federal courthouse in Fresno, and this legislation will ensure that the people of Fresno County continue to receive a judicial benefit from the existing Federal courthouse.

This legislation also includes a number of provisions that will help protect the interests of the Federal Government. Among the provisions included in this legislation are the requirement that the courthouse be used for public purpose for at least 20 years, that the transfer not take place until the new courthouse is completed and occupied, and the conveyance may also include any additional provisions the administrator deems necessary to protect the interests of the government. I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1274, as amended, a bill to convey a Federal courthouse in Fresno, California, to the County of Fresno. The bill transfers for a nominal fee an obsolete Federal building in Fresno, California, to the County of Fresno. The bill ensures that the transfer documents contain a reverter clause, as well as a public use clause, both of which protect Federal interests.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), and ranking member, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), for their work on this legislation and for recognizing that outmoded Federal buildings are still viable and can continue to serve a public purpose. I also commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for introducing this bill, which is a win/win for all parties involved.

I support H.R. 1274 and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1274 as introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and me, and I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for their work in advancing this piece of legislation.

The Eastern District of California is very pleased that they have decided to

build a new Federal courthouse in the city of Fresno. The entire community, as well as the surrounding areas, is very pleased with this investment into the construction of a new courthouse which will serve the needs of the entire Eastern District of California.

This legislation is also very important in that it will transfer the B.F. Sisk Building to the County of Fresno, with the appropriate stipulations that this legislation embodies, ensuring that it remains in public use for a considerable period of time. This also meets the needs of Fresno, it meets the needs of public service, and ensures that the taxpayers' interests are protected. I thank the committee members for advancing this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1274, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. 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. 3198 and H.R. 1274, the measures just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1545

CLARIFYING ACREAGE FOR IRRIGATION WATER UNDER MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3209) to amend the Reclamation Project Authorization Act of 1972 to clarify the acreage for which the North Loup division is authorized to provide irrigation water under the Missouri River Basin project.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3209

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF ACREAGE FOR IRRIGATION WATER.

Section 501 of the Reclamation Project Authorization Act of 1972 (43 U.S.C. 615dddd) is amended by striking ''fifty-three thousand acres'' and inserting ''approximately 53,000 acres''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3209 is a bill I introduced to clarify the amount of acreage for which the North Loup Division is authorized under the Missouri River Basin Project. This bill provides for a technical correction by inserting the word ''approximately'' on the amount of acreage authorized under the project.

Under current law, irrigators must cite the specific amount of irrigated acreage served under the North Loup project. Conflicting Federal and State statutes for reporting irrigable service areas, conversion of irrigated ground to right-of-ways, land conservation programs and habitat easements are causing ever-changing and misunderstood adjustments to irrigated acreage. This bill allows for more flexibility in determining the amount of irrigated acreage.

This is not a new concept and would bring consistency to the act, as well as to contracts between the irrigation districts and the United States. I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bill.

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

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3209 would make a minor change by requiring the North Loup Division of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program to deliver water to ''approximately'' 53,000 acres. Existing law, as was explained by my colleague, requires the project to deliver to exactly 53,000 acres. Yet, the project does not annually deliver water to precisely 53,000 acres.

The bill is not controversial. I urge Members to support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3209.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN WILLIAMSON COUNTY, TEXAS, WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE PROJECT

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1732) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Williamson County, Texas, Water Recycling and Reuse Project, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1732

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

SECTION 1. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Williamson County Water Recycling Act of 2003''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Title XVI of Public Law 102–575; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1635 the following new section:

''SEC. 1636. WILLIAMSON COUNTY, TEXAS, WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE PROJECT.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Lower Colorado River Authority, Texas, is authorized to participate in the design, planning, and construction of permanent facilities to reclaim and reuse water in Williamson County, Texas.

''(b) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1635 the following:

''Sec. 1636. Williamson County, Texas, Water Recycling and Reuse Project.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1732, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning and construction of facilities to reclaim and reuse water in Williamson County, Texas. Williamson County is one of the fastest growing counties in the State of Texas. The Texas Water Development Board has concluded that existing water wells are being overdrawn, and surface water supplies are not meeting current drinking water demands. This bill will allow the communities to stretch potable water resources by replacing drinking water with recycled water on parks, golf courses and school grounds.

This bill is a commonsense solution for communities that want to safeguard drinking water supplies for future generations. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

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

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1732. This bill provides the Secretary of the Interior with authority to help finance a water recycling project to serve residents of Williamson County, Texas. As my colleagues know, these water recycling projects are becoming not only increasingly popular but necessary with communities who need reliable and cost-effective ways to firm up their community clean water supplies. It is unfortunate, however, that this administration refuses to understand and fund the potential of these projects. We will continue to press the administration to support these projects.

H.R. 1732 is not controversial. I urge support for this bill.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support H.R. 1732 which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Williamson County, Texas, water recycling and reuse project. I am proud to represent Williamson County, or most of it, and I have been living there for over 30 years. During this time, I have witnessed Williamson County become one of the fastest growing communities in the entire Nation and it has been consistently the fastest growing county for over a decade. I have observed the needs of this county because it has a limited supply of water. Today some would say that water has replaced oil as the commodity most important to the future of Texas. Unfortunately, current water supplies will simply not meet the growing needs of Williamson County and that community.

To meet this need, I introduced H.R. 1732 to allow the Lower Colorado River Authority, the Brazos River Authority and local communities to work with the Bureau of Reclamation to design, build and construct permanent facilities to reclaim and reuse water in Williamson County. This partnership will be an essential part of the county's water planning efforts.

In short, this legislation will ensure current and future sources of drinking water are made available for the residents of Williamson County. I am excited about this partnership and believe it is a great example of Federal and local agencies working together to make a positive difference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and their staffs for their efforts in having this legislation brought to the floor in a timely manner. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), my neighbor to the north, for joining me in this effort. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

I am very happy to hear the remarks of my colleagues. Water reuse, water recycling has been a very, very critical project and favorite subject of mine. Having been born and raised in Brownsville, Texas, I understand a lot of the Texas issues with the drought along the border that is creating havoc with farming and the economy thereof. I hope that we can continue to address and include funding to be able to expand not only to those areas that are in critical need but also those areas that can be used.

We have no new water in this world. It is all the same water that Mother Earth is recycling for us and we are helping recycle. We just trust that we can convince the administration of its need and begin doing it before we face very critical needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the coauthor of this bill.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership in this very, very important area. I also want to congratulate my colleague and neighbor in Williamson County (Mr. CARTER) for offering this important piece of legislation. Just as oil and gas was the economic engine for Texas in the 20th century, the availability of water will be the economic engine to Texas in the future in the 21st century.

As someone who represents part of Williamson County, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) represents about 80 percent of that county, it is one of the largest, fastest-growing counties in the country. Water usage there is increasing dramatically. Yet our water supply is limited. I was very glad to cosponsor this bill with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and will look forward to working with him to try to see that we find the appropriations to fund this important piece of legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1732, 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.

CORRECTING TECHNICAL ERROR FROM UNIT OF JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1066) to correct a technical error from Unit T–07 of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1066

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

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map described in subsection (b) is replaced by the map entitled ''John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Matagorda Peninsula Unit T07/T07P'' and dated July 12, 2002.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF REPLACED MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) is the map relating to the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier System unit designated as Coastal Barrier Resources System Matagorda Peninsula Unit T07/T07P that is subtitled ''T07/T07P'' and included in the set of maps entitled ''Coastal Barrier Resources System'' and referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)).

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the replacement map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include

extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1066 introduced by Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON will remove 19 acres of private property that has been mistakenly included within the Coastal Barrier Resources System. An identical bill, H.R. 154, has been proposed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). I compliment him for his leadership on behalf of this measure.

Specifically, the Matagorda dunes subdivision in Matagorda, Texas, was placed into the system despite the fact that a full complement of infrastructure, including roads and electricity, existed prior to 1977 and that it exceeded the number of structures per acre rule that is required for inclusion under the act.

For more than 20 years, these homeowners were told they were not within the system and therefore eligible for both Federal flood insurance and State wind insurance. These policies have now been canceled, and it is essential that this mistake be corrected so that their property can be protected from any future flooding problems. It is difficult, if not impossible, to sell coastal property or obtain a home mortgage without access to Federal flood insurance.

During the hearing before the Committee on Resources on this legislation, the administration expressed strong support and a local county judge testified, ''A mistake was made 21 years ago that placed this little subdivision in CBRA. It does not matter who made the mistake, but now since the mistake has come to light, please help us fix it.''

Finally, the House version of this bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Resources. I urge my colleagues to support Senate 1066. I again compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for representing his constituents in such an effective way.

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

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, S. 1066 is a noncontroversial piece of legislation that is identical to companion legislation, H.R. 154, passed and reported by the Committee on Resources earlier this year as was just addressed by my colleague.

By all evidence this technical correction appears to be genuine and needed to fix a legitimate error in the maps depicting the Matagorda subdivision in Unit T–07. For this reason and because this legislation would not undermine the policies of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, Members should not oppose this legislation, and I recommend they vote for it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support S. 1066, the Senate version of my H.R. 154, which I introduced on the first day of the 108th Congress. This legislation fixes a mistake in the official Fish and Wildlife Services' maps by removing a 19-acre area known as Matagorda Dunes, in Matagorda County, Texas, from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources Act (COBRA). This change is fully supported by the Fish and Wildlife Service. In fact, a Fish and Wildlife Service created map, dated July 12, 2002, acknowledges the error.

This change will ensure property owners who had already begun developing this area are able to obtain insurance. Congress never intended to deny these landowners access to insurance. Matagorda Dunes was included in COBRA as a result of a drafting error when the COBRA maps were revised in the early eighties. Unless this mistake is fixed, the result could be catastrophic for these property owners who invested in developing Matagorda Dunes under the belief that the land was excluded from COBRA. A failure to fix this mistake could also be quite costly to the American taxpayers.

Fixing this mistake is also quite important to the people of Matagorda County, which is why a county official traveled to Washington to testify at a hearing on this bill in September. In conclusion, I thank Chairman POMBO and my colleague from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, for their work on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1066.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARPINTERIA AND MONTECITO WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2003

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1648) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution systems of the Cachuma Project, California, to the Carpinteria Valley Water District and the Montecito Water District.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1648

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Carpinteria and Montecito Water Distribution Systems Conveyance Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS OF THE CACHUMA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior—

(1) may convey to the Carpinteria Valley Water District, located in Santa Barbara County, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Carpinteria Distribution System of the Cachuma Project, California, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement entitled ''Agreement Between the United States and the Carpinteria Valley Water District to Transfer Title to the Federally Owned Distribution System to the Carpinteria Valley Water District'' (Agreement No. 00–XC–20–0364); and

(2) may convey to the Montecito Water District, located in Santa Barbara County, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Montecito Water Distribution System of the Cachuma Project, California, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement entitled ''Agreement Between the United States and the Montecito Water District to Transfer Title to the Federally Owned Distribution System to the Montecito Water District'' (Agreement No. 01–XC–20–0365).

(b) LIABILITY.—Effective upon the date of conveyance of a distribution system under this section, the United States shall not be held liable by any court for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the distribution system, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees or agents prior to the date of conveyance. Nothing in this section increases the liability of the United States beyond that provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (popularly known as the Federal Tort Claims Act) on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) BENEFITS.—After conveyance of a water distribution system to the Carpinteria Valley Water District or the Montecito Water District under this section—

(1) such water distribution system shall not be considered to be a part of a Federal reclamation project; and

(2) such water district shall not be eligible to receive any benefits with respect to any facility comprising that distribution system, except benefits that would be available to a similarly situated person with respect to such a facility that is not part of a Federal reclamation project.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1600

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

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer specific water distribution systems of the Cachuma Project of the Carpinteria Valley Water District and the Montecito Water District in Santa Barbara County, California.

While this transfer would only apply to land and facilities and would not affect the repayment obligations of the Federal Government, it will help simplify the operation and maintenance of the districts' water delivery systems and eliminate unnecessary paperwork. Both districts have worked through all Federal requirements and need only to complete the process with an act of Congress.

Transfers such as those included in this bill help shrink the size and budget of Federal Government and help our communities manage our water resources in a more efficient manner. I urge my colleagues to support this consensus bill.

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

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1648 simply authorizes the transfer of certain features of the Bureau of Reclamation's Cachuma Project near Santa Barbara, California, to the local water districts. Allowing the local districts to take over parts of the project will help simplify the operation and maintenance of the districts' water distribution systems. I would like very much to commend the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), my Democratic colleague and sponsor of this bill, who is unable to be on the floor at this moment, for her efforts to get this very important bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1648 is not controversial, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1648, the Carpinteria and Montecito Water Distribution Systems Conveyance Act of 2003—a bill I introduced that would authorize the title transfer of federally owned water distribution systems in my congressional district.

I want to commend my colleagues from California, the chairman of the Resources Committee, Mr. POMBO, the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Mr. CALVERT and Mrs. NAPOLITANO, as well as the ranking member of the full Committee, Mr. RAHALL for expediting the consideration of this legislation in their respective committees and for bringing H.R. 1648 before us today.

This legislation will authorize the title transfer of two federally owned water distribution systems from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Carpinteria Valley Water District and Montecito Water District, as requested by the two Santa Barbara area Districts.

The purpose of the legislation is to simplify the operation and maintenance of the Districts' water distribution systems and eliminate unnecessary paperwork and consultation between the Districts and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Carpinteria Valley Water District and Montecito Water District, which have operated and maintained the facilities proposed for transfer since 1956 and 1995, respectively. The Districts have worked through all requirements of the Bureau of Reclamation's title transfer process including public meetings, fulfillment of their repayment obligations, completion of an environmental assessment, which resulted in a finding of no significant impact (FONSI), and compliance with all other applicable laws. The only step remaining to complete the process is an act of Congress enabling the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title.

The proposed transfer would apply only to lands and facilities associated with these facilities and would not affect the Districts' existing water service contract with the Santa Barbara County Water Agency nor the Federal government receipts from water deliveries under the contract. In addition, the proposed transfer does not envision any new physical modification or expansion of the service infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed transfer of ownership would include the following facilities:

Carpinteria: The distribution system consisting of 36 miles of pipeline and laterals; Gobernador Reservoir; Shephard Mesa Tank; Lateral 10L, Carpinteria and Shephard Mesa pumping plants; several pressure regulating vaults located throughout the system; fences and structures; and rights-of-way, easements, leases and other property permitting access to the Federal system.

Montecito: 9.5 miles of pipelines and laterals; the Asegra Pumping Plant (a deactivated pumping plant connected to a portion of lateral 3 located on Asegra Road); Ortega Ridge Pumping plant located on Ortega Ridge Road; pressure regulating vaults, fences and structures appurtenant to the distribution system; and rights-of-way, easements, leases, and other property permitting access to the Federal system.

Again, I would like to thank the Committee on Resources for supporting this bill, and urge its immediate passage.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from California for her assistance through this process.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1648.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE 101ST AIRBORNE AT FORT CAMPBELL

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk a little bit about the 101st Airborne at Fort Campbell, which is in Clarksville, Tennessee, and in my district. And I have visited with General Petreaus, commander of the 101st, and members of this elite group of American soldiers in Mosul where they are working to stabilize Iraq. Their work in Iraq is absolutely astounding. What they have accomplished is astounding, and it is a testament to their training, to their dedication, and to their love of liberty.

For the past 2 weeks the activity has absolutely broken our hearts. We have lost some of our Nation's finest, and Fort Campbell has lost some loved ones. And to the family, the friends, and their colleagues, we offer our thoughts and our prayers. And we want them to know that America is grateful not only for their service but certainly grateful for their sacrifice.

Throughout the history of the 101st, this country has relied on these brave soldiers, these brave defenders of freedom, to keep us free; and today is no different. We ask that God bless America, that He bless our Fort Campbell families and our fallen heroes.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1900

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) at 7 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S.J. Res. 22, by the yeas and nays;

S.J. Res. 18, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 299, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining votes in this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

RECOGNIZING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE FOR 50 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 22.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 22, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 332, nays 0, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 620]

YEAS—332

Abercrombie
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Boehner
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—102

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baldwin
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boyd
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burr
Calvert
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Davis (IL)
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Emanuel
Fletcher
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Harris
Hart
Herger
Hobson
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jenkins
Kaptur
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lampson
Lipinski
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Pombo
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sessions
Simmons
Sweeney
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Tierney
Velazquez
Waters
Weiner
Wexler
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1922

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

COMMENDING INSPECTORS GENERAL FOR EFFORTS DURING PAST 25 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 18.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 18, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 326, nays 3, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 621]

YEAS—326

Abercrombie
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Boehner
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Chocola
Miller (FL)
Souder

NOT VOTING—105

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baldwin
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boyd
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burr
Calvert
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Davis (IL)
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Emanuel
Fletcher
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Harris
Hart
Herger
Hobson
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Kaptur
Kind
King (IA)
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lampson
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Pombo
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sessions
Simmons
Stenholm
Sweeney
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Tierney
Velazquez
Walsh
Waters
Weiner
Wexler
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1931

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, 2003, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on S.J. Res. 18 and S.J. Res. 22.

HONORING MR. SARGENT SHRIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 299.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 299, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 3, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 622]

YEAS—325

Abercrombie
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Boehner
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NAYS—3

Hefley
Johnson, Sam
Paul

NOT VOTING—106

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baldwin
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boyd
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burr
Calvert
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Davis (IL)
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Emanuel
Fletcher
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Harris
Hart
Herger
Hobson
Hoyer
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Kaptur
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lampson
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sessions
Simmons
Stenholm
Sweeney
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Tierney
Velazquez
Waters
Weiner
Wexler
Wynn
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1938

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and not present on rollcall vote 620, recognizing the Agricultural Research of the Department of Agriculture (S.J. Res. 22);

rollcall vote 621, commending the Inspectors General (S.J. Res. 18); and rollcall vote 622, honoring Mr. Sargent Shriver (H. Con. Res. 299). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' for rollcall votes 620, 621, 622.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was returning from an official delegation trip to Iraq on Monday evening, and was absent from the House floor during the rollcall votes on S.J. Res. 22, recognizing the Agricultural Research Service, S.J. Res. 18, commending the service of Inspectors General; and H. Con. Res. 299, honoring Sargent Shriver. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on each of these resolutions.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2003

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 296, noes 25, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 623]

AYES—296

Abercrombie
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Boehner
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Houghton
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—25

Brown (OH)
Capps
Cooper
DeFazio
Filner
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hooley (OR)
Lee
McDermott
Miller (NC)
Moore
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Rahall
Ross
Rothman
Slaughter
Thompson (MS)
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Watt
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—113

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baldwin
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boyd
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burns
Burr
Calvert
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Davis (IL)
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Emanuel
Flake
Fletcher
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Harris
Hart
Herger
Hobson
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lampson
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McInnis
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Oxley
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Pombo
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sessions
Simmons
Stenholm
Sweeney
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Tierney
Velazquez
Waters
Weiner
Wexler
Wynn
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1954

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, due to a previously scheduled commitment, I missed rollcall votes 620 through 623 on Monday, November 17. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on each measure.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1, the prescription drug bill.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1, be instructed as follows:

(1) To reject the provisions of subtitle C of title II of the House bill.

(2) To reject the provisions of section 231 of the Senate amendment.

(3) Within the scope of conference, to increase payments for physician services by an amount equal to the amount of savings attributable to the rejection of the aforementioned provisions.

(4) To insist upon section 601 of the House bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2660, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 2660, the fiscal year 2004 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill,

H.R. 2660, be instructed to insist on the highest funding levels possible for nutrition programs for our Nation's seniors authorized by the Older Americans Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

CONGRATULATING JOHN GAGLIARDI ON OCCASION OF HIS BECOMING ALL-TIME WINNINGEST COACH IN COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL HISTORY

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 438) congratulating John Gagliardi, football coach of St. John's University, on the occasion of his becoming the all-time winningest coach in collegiate football history.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 438

Whereas John Gagliardi began his coaching career in 1943 at the age of 16 when his high school football coach was drafted and John Gagliardi asked to take over his position;

Whereas John Gagliardi won four conference titles during the six years he coached high school football;

Whereas John Gagliardi graduated from Colorado College in 1949 and began coaching football, basketball, and baseball at Carroll College in Helena, Montana, winning titles in all three sports;

Whereas John Gagliardi took over the football program at St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, in 1953 and the football team won the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference title in his first year as coach;

Whereas by the end of the 2002 season, John Gagliardi had won three national championships, coached 25 conference title teams, appeared in 45 post-season games and compiled a 400–114–11 record during his 50 years at St. John's University;

Whereas under the leadership of John Gagliardi, St. John's University has been nationally ranked 37 times in the past 39 years, and the university set a record with a 61.5 points per game average in 1993;

Whereas over 150 students participate in the St. John's University football program each year and every player dresses for home games;

Whereas John Gagliardi's coaching methods follow the ''Winning with No's'' theory: no blocking sleds or dummies, no whistles, no tackling in practices, no athletic scholarships, and no long practices;

Whereas John Gagliardi has coached over 5,000 players during his 50 years at St. John's University, and no player has failed to graduate and most have graduated in four years;

Whereas, in 1993, the John Gagliardi trophy was unveiled, and it is given each year to the most outstanding Division III football player;

Whereas on November 1, 2003, John Gagliardi tied Grambling University coach Eddie Robinson's record of 408 wins with a 15 to 12 victory over the University of St. Thomas;

Whereas on November 8, 2003, John Gagliardi broke Eddie Robinson's record with a 29 to 26 victory over Bethel College;

Whereas John Gagliardi is admired by his players, as well as by the students, faculty, and fans of St. John's University for his ability to motivate and inspire;

Whereas students who take his course, Theory of Football, credit John Gagliardi for teaching them more about life than about football;

Whereas those closest to John Gagliardi will tell you that football is only part of his life—he values the time he spends with Peg, his wife of 47 years, and their four children; and

Whereas the on- and off-the-field accomplishments of John Gagliardi have placed him in an elite club that includes the best coaches in history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates John Gagliardi, football coach of St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, on becoming the all-time winningest coach in collegiate football history.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 438.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 438. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), for bringing this resolution forward. Mr. Speaker, this resolution recognizes the achievement of Coach John Gagliardi of St. John's University for becoming the all-time winningest coach in collegiate football history.

Coach Gagliardi—John to his players, colleagues and friends—has long been a force in college athletics and in life. In his 51 years at St. Johns, John has found great success on the field, leading St. John's to 23 conference titles and the winningest record in Division III history.

His performance as a coach is impressive, but it tells only one side of the story of this great man. John has invested in thousands of lives over his career in the coaching business. The success earned by the St. John's team reflects the dedication he inspires in each player. John's investment in these young lives is, to him, the most important contribution he can make, and to them the most important reward they will receive.

I extend my congratulations to Coach John Gagliardi on this important day for him and for the St. John's community. I am happy to join my colleagues in honoring a great man and wishing him continued success.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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 rise in support of H. Res. 438. This resolution honors John Gagliardi, the football coach at St. Johns University. Coach Gagliardi is the winningest coach in college football history. This month he overtook the legendary Eddie Robinson by winning the 409th football game of his career. This record puts Coach Gagliardi at the very top of his profession. It should come as no surprise that the students, the student athletes, the faculty and fans of St. John's University greatly admire Coach Gagliardi. Fortunately, we are not only honoring Coach Gagliardi for his winning ways but also his commitment to his school, his team and, most importantly, his players and their education.

Coach Gagliardi has coached over 5,000 players during his 50 years at St. John's. Over that time, none of his players have failed to graduate and most have graduated within 4 years.

□ 2000

This is an amazing feat in today's world of college athletes. Coach Gagliardi more than deserves the honor we are bestowing on him today. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support this resolution.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today to honor St. John's University's Coach John Gagliardi for becoming the winningest college football coach ever. After beating archrival St. Thomas to tie Eddie Robinson's record of 408 wins at Grambling, Coach Gagliardi's Johnnies set a new record by defeating nationally ranked Bethel in a hard-fought game before over 13,000 fans in the natural bowl of Clemens Stadium. That is quite a crowd, since the stadium only seats 5,500.

As a graduate of St. John's, I was honored to be able to join John at the White House today where the President rightly praised both his achievement and his character. Both St. John's University and Coach John Gagliardi are quite special; and as one might expect from a relationship stretching over half a century, they are special for many of the same reasons. Indeed, the similarities begin with both the university and the coach being named ultimately after St. John.

St. John's, with 1,900 male students, is one of the oldest universities in the State of Minnesota, having been founded by Benedictine monks in 1856. It sits on a beautiful campus of 2,400 acres

with four lakes on campus. Their sister school, St. Benedict's, with 2,000 students, was founded by Benedictine nuns in 1913.

The Benedictines live according to the Rule of St. Benedict with an emphasis on faithfulness, community, study, work, prayer, and humility. They have infused these values into the culture of St. John's and St. Ben's as well. Community is important to Johnnie and Bennie alumni, who are among the most loyal anywhere.

Coach Gagliardi has personified these values. After coaching 4 years at Carroll College in Helena, Montana, John has coached at St. John's for the last 51 seasons. That record of faithfulness has been matched with 47 years of marriage to the partner of his life, his wife, Peggy.

The Gagliardi family has been intertwined with the St. John's community. They live on campus, and all four of their children have attended St. John's or St. Ben's. I attended St. John's with their son John, Jr. Their son Jim is one of St. John's assistant coaches and joined him today at the White House. Since he is assistant coach there at St. John's, the President said that he appreciated sons following in their father's footsteps.

Consistent with John's commitment to community, he cuts no one from games, from coming out for football, and over 150 players regularly suit up for home games. In fact, St. John's was recently penalized for having two players with the same number on the field, a penalty few teams ever have to worry about. And while Gagliardi is acclaimed for his perennial success on the football field, he is equally loved and admired at St. John's for his commitment to making sure that his players get a quality education.

Consistent with his commitment to study, I am proud to say that no player has ever failed to graduate in John's over a half century of coaching. Every class of graduating football players includes those who go on to graduate, law, or medical school. St. John's and St. Ben's, which are ranked as among the best Catholic national liberal arts colleges in the country by ''U.S. News and World Report,'' match Gagliardi's commitment to educational excellence. The Benedictine monks have long stressed work and in their early days were almost entirely self-sufficient, growing and building most of what they needed. Coach Gagliardi's personal work ethic is reflected in his intent to continue coaching even after he has achieved this important milestone.

Yet John has a nontraditional view towards work in the form of practice. His practices involve no blocking sleds, no dummies, no whistles, no pads, no tackling, and no mandatory weight training. John does not conduct spring practices, and he gives his team the day off if it is too cold, too hot, or there are too many mosquitos, as is often the case in Minnesota.

But where Gagliardi asks his players to work is on game day. They work and they win. In over 55 years of coaching, he has now had 410 wins and only 114 losses. My son Peter recently commented that it is impossible to be a fair-weather fan of St. John's because they always win. Gagliardi's teams have won 26 conference titles, appeared in 45 post-season games, and won three national championships. Their most recent national championship was in 1976, while I was a student at St. John's, when they beat Towson State of Maryland, a school 10 times its size.

Playing bigger schools is not unusual for St. John's with its 1,900 students. I fondly remember sitting at a playoff game with St. John's president, Brother Dietrich Reinhart, in Dayton, Ohio, against the University of Dayton. They were playing St. John's in football, but Michigan State in basketball that evening.

According to St. John's folklore, prayer is vitally important to their football success. The St. John's abbey is the largest Benedictine abbey in the world. As the saying goes, if the team gets it close, they will pray it in.

Despite John's unmatched record of success, he remains amongst the most humble people one will ever meet. His news director, Michael Hemisch, has a hard time getting him to speak to the press. John avoids the limelight and wears a coat during games that everyone is happy to see has now been contributed to the College Football Hall of Fame, so he will not wear it anymore. But he said it is the only coat that will keep him warm enough for Minnesota falls.

Some were surprised that he accepted President Bush's invitation to come to the White House today. When the press asked him what was the secret of his success, he answered: talented players, luck, and prayers.

Certainly, the many players that have played for Coach Gagliardi should be congratulated on this achievement. John took no credit for himself but would be happy to ascribe some of the credit to his current coaching staff and his coaching staff over the years, three of whom joined him: his son Jim, Jerry Haugen, and Gary Fasching. He would also give credit to the monks, including athletic director Father Tim Backous, who joined him as well at the White House. Father Tim and I sang together at men's chorus at St. John's. And John likes to joke that the monks said they would always be with him, win or tie.

Though John is humble, my fellow alumni at St. John's and St. Ben's, including 13 of my family members, have great pride not just in his success as the winningest college football coach ever but the way his life has modeled the Benedictine values of faithfulness, community, study, work, prayer, and humility.

I appreciated the Johnnies who joined John at the White House and the many that came out to the reception this afternoon here in Washington to honor John, including Senator Dave Durenberger; Al Eisele, editor of ''The Hill,'' David Rehr from the Beer Wholesalers; and Tom Super, whose wife, Kathy, works for President Bush, Sr.

I encourage my fellow Members to join me in honoring his achievement.

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

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

I thank the gentlewoman for her very kind remarks on this occasion, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for bringing this forward. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for this, with a hearty congratulations to Coach John Gagliardi.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 438.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING RICE UNIVERSITY OWLS BASEBALL TEAM

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 379) honoring the Rice University Owls baseball team for winning the NCAA baseball championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 379

Whereas, on June 23, 2003, the Rice University Owls baseball team won the NCAA baseball championship, defeating Stanford, with a final score of 14 to 2, before 18,494 Owls fans in the final game at the College World Series;

Whereas Rice University is a small but prestigious school, which opened in 1912, and prides itself on being one of the Nation's best academic institutions;

Whereas winning the national championship in a major Division I sport is a remarkable accomplishment for Rice University, which has an undergraduate enrollment of only 2,700 students and holds its athletes to the same high academic standards as the rest of the school population;

Whereas, before this 2003 victory, the Owls made three trips to the College World Series, in 1997, 1999, and 2002, but won just one of seven games;

Whereas the Owls' coach, Wayne Graham, advanced Rice University's baseball program from obscurity to a national championship in 12 years;

Whereas the Owls' victory at the College World Series is Rice University's first national championship in any team sport and easily the University's crowning athletic achievement;

Whereas Rice University is the second school in the State of Texas to win the NCAA baseball title, joining the University of Texas, which won titles in 1949, 1950, 1975, 1983, and 2002;

Whereas the Owls' victory completed a remarkable season in which Rice University won 58 of the 70 games it played;

Whereas the Owls opened the 2003 College World Series by first defeating Southwest Missouri State and then by defeating Texas University twice in a span of three days, eliminating the defending national champions and securing a spot in the championship round;

Whereas Rice University defeated Stanford, with a score of 4 to 3, in the first championship game, and then lost to Stanford, with a score of 8 to 3, in the second game, forcing the final game; and

Whereas the final score of 14 to 2, establishing Rice University's national championship victory, is the largest margin of victory in a College World Series final game: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors and congratulates the Rice University Owls baseball team for their successful season and their historic, outstanding, and memorable NCAA baseball championship victory.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 379.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 379. This resolution honors the Rice University Owls baseball team for their victory in the 2003 NCAA baseball championship. With their 14 to 2 victory over Stanford, the Rice Owls scored the largest margin of victory in a College World Series championship game and earned their first, their first, NCAA baseball championship ever. The Owls won five of six games in their fourth College World Series appearance to complete a remarkable season in which they won 58 of their 70 games. The Owls' victory at the College World Series was Rice University's first national championship in any team sport. The distinction earned by these players and the remarkable repeat victories of the team reflect the dedication of each player, the leadership of Coach Wayne Graham, and the support of family, friends, and fans.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL) for introducing this resolution and extend my congratulations to Coach Graham, Rice University, and each of the hardworking players on the successful Owls team. As the only Member of Congress to claim Rice University as my alma mater, I am especially proud and happy to join my colleagues and am very thankful to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in honoring the accomplishment of this team and wishing them continued success. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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 rise in support of H. Res. 379. This resolution honors the Rice University Owls baseball team for winning the NCAA baseball championship. This summer the Rice University Owls captured the national championship in their fourth trip to the College World Series in the past 7 years. College fans, student athletes, and the general public were treated to an exciting 14 to 2 win in the final game of the year's College World Series. I want to extend my hearty congratulations to the Owls' head coach, Wayne Graham. His leadership over the past 12 years has taken baseball at Rice University from obscurity to national prominence. Rice University's student athletes also deserve our congratulations. We are on the floor today because of their hard work, their determination, and their winning ways.

I would be remiss if I did not also recognize the outstanding play by Stanford University's student athletes in the College World Series. Both teams are to be congratulated for their excellent play.

Winning a championship has brought national acclaim to Rice University. I hope the Owls fans and their community treasure this moment for many years to come. And in closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this resolution.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL), the author of this resolution.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to honor the Rice University Owls, the 2003 NCAA baseball national champions. It is a study in persistence. Before this victory, the Owls made three trips to the College World Series in 1997, 1999, and 2002, but won just one of seven games during those three trips.

The Owls' convincing win over Stanford in the College World Series championship game this year brought home the school's first national championship in any team sport.

Rice University is a tremendous source of pride for my 25th Congressional District in Texas. As one of the Nation's most highly regarded universities, Rice has always been well known for its academic excellence. The school now has the added distinction of being a baseball powerhouse. Winning a national title in a major Division I sport is a remarkable accomplishment for a school as small as Rice with only 2,700 undergraduates.

□ 2015

Additionally, Rice athletes are held to the same high academic standards as all of the other students, signifying the incredible well-roundedness of these ball players.

Since starting at Rice 12 years ago, coaching legend Wayne Graham has catapulted the team into baseball history. Coach Graham's leadership took Rice to the NCAA tournament in 1995 and to the College World Series in 1997, 1999 and 2002. Previously, Coach Graham won five national junior college titles at San Jacinto College.

The Owls had an unforgettable season, winning 58 of their 70 games. Early in the season, the team broke a school record by winning 30 games in a row. In the College World Series, Rice beat Southwest Missouri State and last year's champion University of Texas team twice, before meeting Stanford in the championship round. Rice beat Stanford 4–3 in the first game, lost 8–3 in the second, and won the championship, 14–2, the largest margin of victory in the history of the College World Series championship games.

Mr. Speaker, with wholehearted enthusiasm, I congratulate Coach Graham and the entire Rice Owl College World Series championship team, including Philip Umber, Jeff Niemann, Wade Townsend, Vincent Sinisi, Enrique Cruz, Craig Stansberry, Paul Janish, Chris Kolkhorst, Austin Davis, Dan Bubela, Justin Ruchti, David Aardsma, Joseph Baker, Jeff Blackinton, Matthew Cavanaugh, Lyndon Duplessis, Matthew Emerson, Jonathan Gillespie, Steven Herce, Sean Hirsch, Jeff Jorgensen, Colin Matheny, Matthew Moake, and Lance Pendleton.

These players' success, both in the classroom and on the baseball field, make them stand out as the very best college sports has to offer. They played with honor and sportsmanship and raised the bar for the expectations of college athletes everywhere. Well done, Owls. You have made Houston, Texas very proud.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL) for authoring this legislation in honoring the National Champion Rice University baseball team. I commend the hard work of the players and their coaches. Their years of training and preparation, combined with their ability to work together as a team, led to an outstanding and overwhelming victory.

It is also important to recognize the unwavering dedication of the Rice supporters who cheered the team to victory. All Texans are proud of Rice University. Rice University, its alumni, the city of Houston, the Houston Astros and others have honored the Rice baseball team, and now the Congress is joining the local community and the State to show our support for their achievement.

I have the great honor of being a father of a Rice Owl. My daughter Xochil

attends Rice University, and I am proud that she has chosen to be a part of this outstanding academic institution. Not only is Rice University one of the Nation's top-ranking schools, Rice University students have distinguished themselves by creating a unique academic atmosphere that provides a well-rounded educational experience.

The win at this year's College World Series marks the first national championship for a Rice University sports team, but with the hard work and the discipline shown by the group of student athletes, I have no doubt that this is only the first of many accomplishments and championships. Congratulations, Rice University.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to place in the RECORD a statement in offering my congratulations to the Rice University baseball team for winning the College World Series.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the Rice University Baseball team. An exemplary group of young men, the Rice team won its first baseball national championship this year and showed the true grit needed to win the College World Series.

The Owls have been no stranger to the College World Series, appearing with the best of college baseball for 4 out of the last 7 years. The championship eluded them, however, until this year when they finished the regular season with an impressive 58–12 record. Thirty of those wins came during a remarkable winning streak.

And being a University of Houston graduate, it pains me to admit that the Owls' streak began with a 3–0 win over my beloved Cougars. However, if we had to lose to a crosstown rival, I'm glad that it was one who went on to win the national championship.

The national championship was even sweeter for Houstonians considering that the Owls crushed a Stanford team that had made its third trip to the finals in the past 4 years. And in winning the final game 14–2, the Rice team secured the largest margin of victory in any College World Series final game. Without a doubt, Rice's national championship is a well-deserved honor for a first-rate team.

My congratulations go out to the Owls, along with my best wishes for a successful 2004 season in defense of their title.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank, again, the gentlewoman from California for her kind remarks and the other speakers today, and certainly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL) for authoring this resolution. I will dare to speak on behalf of all Rice alumni and say to Coach Graham and to the team, congratulations and thank you from the bottom of our hearts. The first-ever NCAA championship is a big thing to the alumni community and Rice University.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 379.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL 6 A.M. TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2003 TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until 6 a.m. on November 18, 2003 to file a conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 6) to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF JONESTOWN AND THE DEATH OF CONGRESSMAN LEO RYAN

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 25th anniversary of the massacre at Jonestown where more than 900 people lost their lives to the sick cause of a sociopath masquerading as a visionary.

Among the victims was my distinguished predecessor and good friend, Congressman Leo Ryan, the first Member of Congress ever killed in the line of duty. He was gunned down along with four others of his delegation whom he led to investigate reports of human rights abuses in the jungles of Guyana.

Mr. Speaker, while we continue to struggle to understand such events, let us also continue to commemorate the people they affect.

I would like to ask all of my colleagues for a moment of silence to remember our fallen colleague, my predecessor representing the San Francisco peninsula in Congress, Congressman Leo Ryan, and to honor his work for justice and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, November 18, is the 25th anniversary of the massacre at Jonestown. A quarter century ago, more than 900 people lost their lives to the sick cause of a sociopath masquerading as a visionary.

Among the victims was Congressman Leo Ryan, the first Member of Congress ever killed in the line of duty. He was gunned down, along with four others of the delegation that he led to investigate reports of human rights abuses at a compound in the jungles of Guyana. Ten members of his group were wounded, some of them seriously, including California State Senator Jackie Speier, who was then a member of Congressman Ryan's staff.

In addition to those who died, thousands more were directly affected by the Jonestown tragedy: the grieving family members and friends of those who had misplaced their faith in the so-called Peoples Temple led by Jim Jones.

Mr. Speaker, survivors of that misguided movement, as well as relatives of Leo Ryan and of others who died, are gathering in Foster City, California, in a park that bears Congressman Ryan's name. They will consider his gifts and accomplishments as a public servant, and they will carry on with the struggle to make sense of the events that cut short his life and those of so many others.

Leo Ryan dedicated his life to protecting the oppressed. Elected to the California State Assembly in 1962, he was so moved by the conditions that led to the Watts Riots two years later that he volunteered as a substitute schoolteacher in Watts while the community rebuilt itself. This was typical of Leo Ryan: Confronted with a complex situation of social injustice, he insisted on getting his facts firsthand. In 1970, after hearing about abuses against convicts in California's top-security institutions, he spent a week undercover behind bars in Folsom Prison to see for himself how they were treated.

Mr. Speaker, this hands-on approach characterized Leo Ryan's work here in Congress, where he served on the Foreign Affairs Committee. In early 1978, concerns had been raised about U.S. citizens being held against their will in Guyana; stories were filtering out about beatings and forced rehearsals for mass suicides. When constituents brought the issue to Leo Ryan's attention, he took action.

There were warnings, but characteristically, Congressman Ryan was undeterred. He moved with caution, yet without trepidation, to organize a trip to Guyana. And to alert the world to what he expected to find, he brought along with him a handful of journalists, as well as members of the Concerned Relatives group whose loved ones were in the thrall of Jim Jones. But after challenging Jones and confirming some of his concerns, Leo Ryan, three of the journalists and a defector from the Peoples Temple were to lose their lives on a jungle airstrip as the cataclysm at Jonestown began.

What lessons can be drawn from these experiences, Mr. Speaker? What can we conclude when we continue to see the rise of aberrant social groups that use violence to control their members, and are capable of unleashing brutality upon the world?

Jim Jones' methods of control mirror those of totalitarian leaders throughout history. He created a cult of personality centered on himself, demanded absolute obedience, isolated those who surrounded him from their former lives, and instilled in them a profound sense of paranoia about the outside world.

The Peoples Temple's members were manipulated to see in it whatever they wanted it to be. It was a self-help group for some, for others a religious movement, and for many it represented a new means to address society's

shortcomings. Jim Jones also managed to legitimize the group among some conventional religious and political leaders by supporting their public events and contributing money to their causes during the years when the Peoples Temple was based in San Francisco.

How could so many people find themselves hoodwinked to varying degrees, letting themselves even be linked with this deviant community, much less joining its ranks and sacrificing their lives?

Mr. Speaker, it is a hard question to confront. And the Peoples Temple example teaches us most dramatically not to be seduced by easy answers. It is left to historians and specialists in mass psychology to piece together and place in context the puzzle of Jonestown, the rise of Fascism in Europe, and any number of other instances in which a twisted and charismatic individual has found ways to exploit the weaknesses of large groups and to destroy their will.

As John Ross Hall wrote in one of the definitive studies of Jonestown, Gone From the Promised Land, ''We hear the screams, but we do not entirely understand them, and we will continue to wrestle with the apocalypse they unveiled.''

And I would add, we will continue to commemorate the victims, and to pay tribute to their lives. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a moment of silence here in this chamber to remember our fallen colleague, my predecessor representing the San Francisco Peninsula in Congress, Leo Ryan, and to honor his work for justice and human rights.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). 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.

H.R. 876, THE LOCAL RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND INVESTMENT ACT

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on behalf of thousands of America's rural communities, and I would like to focus attention on a looming crisis within our Nation's transportation infrastructure. Short line railroads, rural America's link to the national rail network, are approaching a crisis point.

Before the rail industry was deregulated, Federal policy created a tremendous investment disincentive whose repercussions can still be felt today. With America's generation of heavier rail cars, which many short lines cannot accommodate, this situation has grown worse. We must move quickly, because thousands of miles of track are in danger of being abandoned forever.

Over 550 short line rail carriers now operate 30 percent of the Nation's rail network. Short line railroads exist in all 50 States and in over 70 percent of all congressional districts. They operate 50,000 miles of track, employ over 23,000 workers at an average wage of $47,000, and earn $3 billion in annual revenue.

Today, this local service is threatened due to the introduction of heavier 286,000 pound railcars that have become a new industry standard. Because of the interconnectivity of our Nation's rail network, short lines are forced to use these heavier cars, placing an added strain on track structure and making rehabilitation urgent. Studies indicate that it will take $7 billion in new investment for our Nation's short lines to accommodate these heavier railcars. To keep our constituents connected with the national rail network, these lines must be upgraded. Unfortunately, the small railroad revenue is insufficient to get the job done.

Today, our Nation's short line railroads need help to make the capital investment required to maintain and rebuild rail service between rural and urban America. This is why I introduced H.R. 876, the Local Railroad Rehabilitation and Investment Act. This legislation has enjoyed bipartisan support with, currently, 178 cosponsors. H.R. 876 provides a $10,000-per-mile tax credit as an offset for rehabilitation investments needed to maintain and strengthen local rail service. This temporary incentive program provides a valuable tool for our railroads to rebuild and improve as they work to meet our Nation's increasing shipping needs.

Short line railroads play an important role in my home State of Kansas. Kansas ranks second in the Nation in the amount of farm products it ships out of State by rail. These railroads keep our farmers and small businesses connected to a national rail network. However, since 1980, approximately 2,500 miles of short line rail in Kansas have been abandoned.

In my State alone, the loss of short line railroads would add nearly $50 million in annual repair costs to the State's highway system. The loss of short line rail service could also add over $20 million to the annual cost of transporting and handling the State's wheat harvest, which would result in an annual net decline in farm income of over $17 million. Nearly every State and every congressional district would experience similar consequences without short line rail service.

Congress should have a strong interest in preserving the freight connection between rural and urban America, because once track is abandoned, odds are it will never be replaced. In today's world, a disruption of the network that carries our food, raw materials, and the fuel for our power plants can be ill afforded. Tens of thousands of jobs in agriculture, manufacturing, refining, and mining in almost every congressional district depend upon this service. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this vital transportation infrastructure legislation, and I ask the leadership of this Congress to bring this bill forward.

PHARMACEUTICAL PROMOTION AND PROFITS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, Christmas has come early for the pharmaceutical and insurance industries, and it is going to be presented as a very large and complex piece of legislation that as yet no rank and file Member of Congress, no Democrat on this side of the Hill, has been able to review, and it will be voted on later this week.

It is being cast as simply a pharmaceutical benefit for seniors and some sort of a revision of Medicare to make it competitive and so on and so forth. But what it really is is legislation that was written by and for the pharmaceutical and insurance industries, the most powerful lobbies in this country and the most generous of campaign contributors, particularly to the President and the Republican Party; and it is first and foremost designed to protect their profits. In fact, perhaps we should call it the ''Pharmaceutical Promotion and Profits Protection Act.'' That would be an apt title.

Boston University School of Public Health has analyzed the bill and they said, 61 percent of the benefits will flow as increased profits to the pharmaceutical industry. The bill specifically prohibits the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of America's seniors and, indeed, all of the American people, to do anything to lower the extortionate price of prescription drugs in the United States. In fact, it closes the door on the importation of prescription drugs from Canada, which is the only relief that many Americans are able to find today. Oh, they say, well, we do not close the door; we are going to give the authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to certify whether or not American-manufactured, FDA-approved pharmaceuticals that have had a short vacation in Canada, where their price goes down by 50 percent or more, would be safe if they flowed back into the United States. And, of course, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in his wisdom, has already said that he will not find them to be safe, just to reassure the industry. So they will give him a power which he will not use, or which he has already arbitrarily decided.

In fact, it is arguable that the chain of custody of drugs in Canada is safer than in the United States of America, and it would be arguable that, in fact, those drugs would be safer than those that are sometimes made available in the system here because of unregulated, unlicensed pharmacies, and phoney, closed-door pharmacies and other things that were exposed recently in a series by the Washington Post. But nonetheless, we are going to act to protect here, and what we are really protecting, the Congress will vote, and I am sure the House will

vote; the President is proposing and the conference committee has proposed to protect the profits of the pharmaceutical industry.

Then, not to leave out the insurance industry, because they are almost as generous in their campaign contributions, we are going to set up a new market for them where we will subsidize the private health insurance industry to create competition. Now, is that not ironic?

□ 2030

The only industry in the United States of America exempted from antitrust law, an industry which can, and does, legally fix prices, collude with their so-called competitors, and, you know, collude also to determine who they might cover or not cover, we are going to bring about competition by subsidizing them.

There are quite a few seniors in my district that have a rather bitter taste in their mouths about the HMO Medicare+Choice and all these other foolhardy things that have been levied upon them. Those companies walked away one day and left them high and dry. And under this bill they will be able to walk away again and leave people high and dry or they will be able to choose the people they want to cover and tell the rest of them to go over to the Medicare fee-for-service plan which will be more expensive. It will get ever more expensive because all the low-risk people will be moved out and taken by the insurance industry and these subsidized plans until they become high risk, until they have to actually file a claim. That is the way the insurance industry works in America today: they will cover you until you ask them to cover something that you have been paying premiums for. And the next time renewal comes up, sorry, we will not renew you. This does not go on just in health care; it is going on in homeowners and car insurance and everything else. But it is particularly egregious in the area of health care. This bill is going to do nothing to rectify that problem.

Let us look at what the great benefits will be. In the first year, next year, there will be discount cards that will come out before the election so the President can say he did something for people, which will be to give a discount, maybe as much as 15 to 25 percent. That means that seniors will only have to pay 50 to 75 percent more than they would have to pay for those drugs imported from Canada. Oh, what a benefit that is. No, but it is a wonderful windfall for the pharmaceutical industry. They will still be paying prices higher than people covered by other private insurance plans, as are Federal employees, as am I, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, and many others; but they will get that juicy 15 to 25 percent discount.

Then the big plan kicks in in 2007. Why 2007? Because people, if it went into effect sooner, if it was such a great deal, people might figure out what a turkey it is before the next election. So they will dangle it out there 4 years in the future and say this will be really great, you just wait. It is so complicated, few people can figure it out. But here are a couple of numbers. A person who pays $1,000 for pharmaceuticals under this great plan would only pay $945 for their pharmaceuticals after they did their premiums and copayments and deductibles. They would get a benefit of $55 on an annual $1,000 prescription drug benefit.

Well, let us look at someone who has much bigger costs. Someone who pays $3,700, $300 a month. Their benefit would be a grand total of $855. Only about, you know, half of that they could get purchasing the drugs from Canada. This is a sham.

MEDICARE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this summer AARP devised a litmus test for Medicare legislation. Specifically, AARP said Congress must be careful not to pass any legislation that jeopardizes employer-sponsored retiree benefits, or that leaves such large gaps in the drug coverage that seniors still will not be able to afford needed medicines, or that includes a premium support privatization provision which will invariably give HMOs control over Medicare, or undercuts popular support for the Medicare program by requiring higher-income beneficiaries to pay more for the same coverage. In other words, we should not pass any legislation that introduces means testing into Medicare.

The Medicare conference committee agreement that was outlined this weekend still jeopardizes employer-sponsored retiree coverage for 12 million seniors. In other words, as many as a third of the seniors who now have prescription drug coverage will lose it under this bill because employers will say why should we do it, we will put you in that government program.

It still leaves such huge gaps in coverage the average senior will run out of drug benefits by August each year. Understand that the average senior will run out of drug benefits two-thirds of the way through the year, but, get this, will still be required to pay the premiums through December. That is a great deal.

It still includes a premium support provision that stacks the deck so resolutely against Medicare fee-for-service, the Medicare that seniors in this country respect and love and have benefited so greatly from. It stacks the deck so resolutely against the Medicare fee-for-service program that seniors will have no choice but to join a private insurance HMO. And it still means tests seniors.

What else does this bill do? It creates a $12 billion slush fund for HMOs to induce them to provide coverage. If anyone still believes privatizing Medicare will reduce health care costs, this $12 billion bribe going to the insurance industry from U.S. taxpayers, this $12 billion bribe should cure them of that misperception.

Mr. Speaker, there is no surprise here. After all, the insurance industry gives tens of billions of dollars to my friends on the other side of the aisle, to President Bush, to Vice President CHENEY, to Republican legislative leadership. This bill also increases drug profits by nearly 40 percent, an estimated $139 billion over 8 years. Again, no surprise there, Mr. Speaker. The drug industry gives actually tens and tens of billions of dollars to President Bush. The word on the street in Washington is they may give $100 million to President Bush's reelection. So, of course, they are going to look out for the drug industry.

Coincidentally, this bill specifically prohibits the Federal Government from negotiating lower prices on behalf of seniors and taxpayers to secure lower drug prices. It abandons the one strategy that would deliver meaningful drug savings to seniors, businesses, and all prescription drug purchasers. It abandons legislation that my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who is in this Chamber, worked on; the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a lot of us on both sides of the aisle worked on. It abandons legislation to allow importation of prescription drugs, safe, affordable prescription drugs from Canada and other countries that charge one-third, one-fourth, one-fifth as much as they do in the United States.

Other countries negotiate for lower drug prices, but the U.S. is a passive drug taker. As a result, U.S. consumers get robbed; the drug industry gets rich. This bill ignores public support for prescription drug reimportation from other countries for lower price, the same drug but for lower price, ignores the consequences for consumers, for employers, and for the Federal Treasury if we fail to bring drug prices down.

Seniors cannot afford the high cost, employers cannot afford the high cost, taxpayers cannot afford the high cost of prescription drugs anymore in this country.

If anyone still believes the drug industry and the insurance industry are not the ghost writers of this bill and are not its principal beneficiaries, perhaps the $12 billion HMO slush fund, the $139 billion in additional drug industry profits, the prohibition on negotiated drug prices, and the stifling of prescription drug importation just might convince you.

One more thing. While the drug and insurance industries fair extremely well under this legislation, the bill's

authors decided to cut corners by barring 3.9 million seniors living at or near poverty from receiving low-income prescription drug assistance.

Under the deal described this weekend, a senior earning $8,000 a year may still be required to pay as much as $2,500 to $3,500 for coverage. That is not protection, Mr. Speaker. It is a cruel joke.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

FALSE PROMISE FOR AMERICA'S SENIORS

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, after years of talk about the need to help our seniors with the high cost of prescription drugs, it appears that sometime this week, or perhaps this weekend, this Congress will be voting. They will be voting on a bill that is nothing more than a false hope and a false promise for America's seniors. In fact, Max Richmond, the head of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, a nonpartisan, not bipartisan, but a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, has been quoted as saying, ''Have you ever heard of Medicare fraud? Well, this Republican prescription drug bill is Medicare fraud.''

Let me tell you why. As I see it, there are three major problems with the bill. Problem number one: the Republican leadership actually had the nerve to put language in the bill that says the Federal Government shall be prohibited from negotiating with the big drug manufacturers to bring down the high cost of medicine. That is in the bill. Then they call it a seniors bill.

Problem number two is the prescription drug plan will be privatized. And what is worse than that is the rest of Medicare could very well be privatized by 2010 under this bill. Insurance is about spreading the risk. When our homeowners policy comes due, sure, we complain; but when you think about the fact that they will replace everything in our house and build us a new house if something happens, it is fairly reasonable, the premium we pay. And why is that? When is the last time you saw a home in your neighborhood burn down or get blown away? It does not happen very often. Insurance is about spreading the risk.

Well, with seniors there is no risk to spread. Seniors require a lot of medicine and a lot of health care to either get well or to stay healthy. That is why we created Medicare 38 years ago.

So why do the Republican leadership and the big drug manufacturers want to privatize the Medicare prescription drug benefit? Well, let me tell you why. You hear about how prescription drugs are less expensive in other countries. It is true. I did a survey about a year ago where I compared the price paid by seniors of the five most commonly used brand-name drugs in my district with seven other countries. And guess what we found: seniors in my district pay on average 110 percent more than seniors in these other countries.

Now, why is that? Because America is the only industrialized Nation in the world where people go without health insurance; 43.6 million of them today, 10 million of them are children and the rest of them, for the most part, are people that are trying to do the right thing and work jobs, but they are working the jobs with no benefits.

In other countries everybody has health care. And in other countries they tell the big drug manufacturers if you want your medicine, your brand in our country, you are going to give us a discount. And they do. And the drug manufacturers and the Republican leadership know good and well that if we have 40 million seniors under one plan in America, that we too will demand those kinds of discounts to help offset the cost of this program.

So they want to privatize the plan and spread seniors out over about 100 plans and have 100 different insurance companies knocking on your door and calling and sending mail to your mother or dad or grandfather or grandmother all trying to sell them, what? Exactly the same plan. Privatization will not work.

The third big problem with this is it is not really a meaningful benefit. Most people who are fortunate enough to have a private health insurance company, and every plan is a little different, but most people who are fortunate to have private health insurance, well, the first $3,500 worth of medicine they pay about $700 out of pocket. Under this Republican prescription drug plan, on the first $3,500 worth of medicine, seniors are going to get stuck with $2,600 of it. All this talk in Washington amounts to $900 worth of help on the first $3,500 worth of medicine.

You see, it is going to have a $250 deductible. And during that time, you have got to pay the monthly premium, which they say may be $35; but they are not real sure what it will be, it could be more. And then after $250 up to $2,000, Medicare is going to pay 80 percent and you pay 20 percent. That sounds pretty good. But on a $100 prescription, once you get to the $250 mark and you are paying $20, what happens when you hit $2,000? All the way up to $3,500 you are back paying the full $100. Medicare pays nothing. But they still bill you monthly for this premium. This is Medicare fraud. It is wrong. This is America, and we can do better than that by our seniors.

□ 2045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

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

There was no objection.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG MARKET ACCESS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the whole 5 minutes. I have been listening to the discussions about Medicare reforms, and I must tell my colleagues that some of the arguments they are making on the other side, I agree with. Some of them, I do not agree with.

I do want to let Members know that in first hour there will be a special order, and I invite Members from the Republican and Democrat and Independent parties to join us tonight and talk about the issue of market access because I think that is one thing that most Members here in the House agree on, and that is, that Americans deserve to have world class prices for world class drugs.

As the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) was just saying, in the studies that he has done, in the studies that I have done, the studies that other Americans have done, that have been done by the press and other groups, they all come to the same conclusion; and that is that Americans pay by far and away the world's highest prices,

even though we are the world's best customers.

Later on tonight, we will be talking about that issue and whether or not there is a way that we, here in the House, can exercise the will of the people and get something done on that issue before we go home for the break.

BEWARE THE GHOSTS OF CHRISTMAS PAST

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of both my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) and also my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) in the concern about what happened in the Medicare conference committee on prescription drugs.

It is sad that we came here to talk about a prescription drug plan for seniors, but we are actually going to take it away from them in the process. But the reason I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to talk about the problem we have in our country with the unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, as we embark on what we hope will be our last week in sessions before the holiday recess, I rise to warn my colleagues about the ghost of Christmas Past, the economic mistakes that Congress and this administration have made on the eve of past holidays. Let us take time to learn from those mistakes and not recreate them.

I can say with confidence that each Member of this Chamber was pleased to hear the impressive economic growth figures for July through September. Over the past 3 years, this country has suffered through some of the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression, and it was certainly uplifting to see the reports of 7.2 percent growth in gross domestic product. While we remain optimistic about an economic rebound for the country, I, however, caution my colleagues against relying on the sustainability of this economic growth.

Economic indicators show that these figures were the result of consumer spending and a tremendous boost in the housing market. Yet with consumer spending outpacing consumer income, it is clear that spending cannot fuel our economic growth indefinitely. Let us remember our reaction to similar news in 2002. After months of job losses and a dismal economic growth, the country boasted growth of 5 percent in the first quarter of 2002. Despite our optimism, however, job losses continued and the next quarter yielded a 1.3 percent growth.

This time last year we were celebrating third quarter growth of 4 percent, and like today, entering the holidays with high hopes. Needless to say, our hopes were dashed and the country has since endured the worst job conditions in 20 years. These are our ghosts of Christmas Past, the flurry of mistaken optimism that failed to deliver on its economic promises.

Like the optimism of Christmas Past, this recent economic growth belies the fact that our manufacturing sector has cut jobs for the 39th straight month. My State of Texas, with 1.6 million lost jobs, ranks third in the amount of manufacturing jobs lost since September of 2000. While the country may be making modest gains in employment, 6 percent of America's workers are still unemployed. Almost one-quarter of these 8.8 million people have been out of work for more than 6 months. These figures do not even count the discouraged workers, 462,000 Americans who have completely given up looking for jobs and are no longer on our unemployment roles.

Fortunately, many former unemployed workers have found jobs, but we must examine the kind of jobs they are turning to; 4.8 million Americans work part-time, but only because they cannot find full-time work, and many of these workers are former engineers, former computer technicians who previously earned up to $60,000 a year, but now must settle for $7.50 an hour at a retail store.

No amount of economic statistics can hide the realities that these people face. Our unemployed workers are hurting. Our unemployed families are draining their savings to survive. And this Congress holds in its hands the ability to extend their unemployment benefits.

Let me remind my colleagues that the holiday season is the time of the year when we give thanks for our blessings and extend our hearts to the less fortunate. Last year, that important lesson must have been lost on the majority's leadership, because Congress packed up for the year without extending unemployment benefits.

That is right. Congress left town to enjoy the holidays and in doing so, left America's unemployed workers in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, this year is no different. Unfortunately, if we do not act soon, the Ghost of Christmas Past will be forced to remind us of the tremendous mistake we made by withholding these benefits last year. Even Scrooge learned from his mistakes.

I implore the administration and my colleagues to let us take a hard, realistic look at our economy and make sure that any recovery helps the Americans who have been most hurt by this downturn, and above all, let us pass the extension of the temporary unemployment benefits before we adjourn for the holidays.

It is the right thing to do for our economy and for America's unemployed.

IRAQ PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Coalition Provisional Authority which is the title of the American authority overseeing the reconstruction of Iraq, and the Bush administration which created it, are openly dissatisfied with the stories the media has chosen to broadcast regarding the United States' role in Iraq. In fact, they say the news media too often covers the negative events that occur in Iraq, but rarely reports any positive happenings there. They even pressured reporters to find the so-called good news in Iraq or lose access in an attempt to manipulate the stories coming out of Iraq.

Let us keep in mind that over 400 American soldiers have died in Iraq since the start of the war in March. That is more than 11 brave young men and women killed each week. It is hard to find the good news when our sons and daughters keep coming home in body bags. And it is exceptionally insulting to the families of these victims to complain about media bias at the same time four helicopters have been destroyed by enemy fire over the last 2 weeks.

The situation in Iraq is getting less safe for our troops, not safer. In addition to the 404 troops killed in action, over 2,000 have been wounded and another 7,000 have been evacuated for noncombat medical conditions. And yet, the President continues to complain about media bias. So what has the White House decided to do about the quote/unquote ''unfair reporting'' by the media?

Why, bypass that very media, of course. The President's handlers plan to influence public perception by creating a government-run broadcast operation to provide American news agencies unfettered access to the real stories in Iraq. This broadcasting system which the administration unofficially refers to as C–SPAN Bagdad will run via satellite 24 hours a day. C–SPAN Bagdad. More like American Al-Jazeera, the media giant that reports to the Arab world in a very biased fashion.

The White House is increasingly aware, of course, that President Bush's fate in the upcoming 2004 election is directly linked to the progress of the war in Iraq. So bypassing the third-party national media allows the Bush administration to mold public perception of the war effort. I think our country's founders would be ashamed to know that at the same time hundreds of our soldiers and thousands of Iraqi civilians are dying, President Bush is thinking about the chances for reelection. That is nothing short of appalling.

But equally appalling is that the American taxpayer will finance this shameful propaganda machine. That is right. The administration is directing money from the $87 billion emergency supplemental spending bill that Congress approved last month to help pay

for the new Bush media machine. This is not emergency spending. This is campaign spending. This is propaganda spending. Instead of trying to win the hearts and minds of Americans through propaganda, President Bush should be trying to win the hearts and minds of the insurgents who are making Iraq less stable. He should show them a United States to which burgeoning democracies like Iraq can aspire, a United States that would be a democratic model for the rest of the world. I daresay an autocratic state-sponsored propaganda campaign is not a part of this model.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SOLIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TENTATIVE AGREEMENT ON MEDICARE CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my extreme disappointment regarding the tentative agreement that has been reached by the Republicans in Congress with regard to Medicare and prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the source of my frustration stems from the fact that this agreement is not good public policy. It is not good for seniors or any Medicare consumer and it does nothing to reduce the cost of soaring prescription drugs.

What this bill does, simply stated, is it kills the Medicare program and, in the process, shores up hundreds of billions of dollars of funding for the HMO industry and for the name-brand pharmaceutical industry. If this so-called deal is enacted into law, make no mistake about it, the Medicare program will be privatized. Medicare, as we know it today, will be turned into a voucher system and seniors will be forced into HMO's.

Republicans are trying to fool us into believing that their privatization provisions are merely a demonstration project or a test, but nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Medicare provisions are unacceptable because they have nothing to do with prescription drugs. The ''demo'' goes way beyond the scope of providing seniors with prescription drug coverage, and, in fact, aims to bankrupt seniors, denying them their right to adequate health care under Medicare, and ultimately forcing them into HMOs because they can no longer afford Medicare.

This is exactly where the insurance companies come in to get their big payoff because greater risk and cost are shifted to senior citizens.

Furthermore, the provisions in the medicare agreement that deal with prescription drug coverage are completely inadequate in terms of benefit structure. We are talking about a $275 deductible, a $35 monthly premium, 75–25 coverage, in other words, 75 percent paid by the Federal Government, 25 percent by the senior to the first $2,200 and no assistance until $3,600, at which point, the catastrophic is reached. So there is a huge doughnut hole; basically, between $2,200 and $3,600, in assistance, seniors get nothing. This means that seniors will have to pay nearly $2,600 before the government pays for all drug costs.

Twenty million seniors or half of all seniors will be paying premiums year-round but would have no coverage for part of the year due to this large gap or doughnut hole in the coverage.

Now, the combination of this insufficient benefit combined with watered-down generic provisions, watered-down reimportation provisions, and the prohibition of the Medicare Administrator to negotiate lower drug prices brings me to my point that this Medicare final agreement is a giveaway to the name-brand pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many fundamental problems with this upcoming Medicare agreement beyond what I have discussed tonight. There is no Medicare fallback in this bill that is favorable to seniors. We expect 2 to 3 million retirees to have their coverage dropped. Ten million, or one out of four, seniors will be forced to pay more for Medicare or to join an HMO. Low-income seniors are not financially protected and will be subject to an assets test for the first time in Medicare history. And the Medicare Part B will rise for the first time in 12 years. Means testing will be implemented in the Medicare program for the first time in its history, and tax sheltered accounts for the wealthy are going to be part of this bill, even though it is not really a Medicare bill.

Mr. Speaker, the list of problems in this so-called Medicare agreement is overwhelming, and I really do not know how the Republicans or groups like the AARP or the President and others who have endorsed this agreement can live with their deceit and ill will against America's seniors.

□ 2100

UNDERMINING THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF MEDICARE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE). This week is one of the most important weeks that I have seen in the 16 years I have been in the Congress because we are dealing with an issue that is about the question of what is in the common good.

We have no problem in this country believing that fire departments and police departments and road systems and schools are issues of the common good. We all pay our taxes. We all get benefits from them, and we have since 1964 had a program in this country called Medicare which was a program in which everybody put their money and people over the age of 65 took out their money to pay for health care benefits when they needed them. Everybody got the same thing everywhere in the whole country.

But there have been people in this Congress who have always thought that the idea of doing something collectively was somehow, I do not know, socialism or something bad. I do not know. They believe that everybody should be individually responsible for themselves, that they should be on their own and that they should deal with these things in a market, like they were buying cars or buying refrigerators or television sets.

So we have a bill before us that is going to undo what we have had in this country for senior citizens for the last 38 years. They have been waiting. They have been trying to do this for 4 or 5 years.

I was on the Medicare commission. One of the Members of the other body and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) of this body and I represented the Democrats on that commission, and we managed to hold off the disaster which is being foisted on the senior citizens and the country itself in the next week.

This attitude about the common good really began to be undermined under Mr. Reagan. It was his campaign slogan in 1980: Are you better off than you were 4 years ago? Not are ''we'' better off than we were 4 years ago, but are ''you.''

This bill is going to say we are going to guarantee a premium support to every senior citizen in this country; we are going to write them a check, $5,900, $6,000, $6,300, whatever; and we are going to say now you, grandma, take that check out and find yourself an insurance company that will take care of what your needs are. You can stay in the program of Medicare as we know it, but since the healthy and the least sick will go out and find these good deals somewhere, who will be left in the regular program? The old and the sick.

The price per person is going to go up, so they are going to raise the premium on anybody who stays in the regular program. Is that thinking about the common good, that we are going to pick on the ones who are the old and the sick, and we are going to let the young and the healthy seniors go off and make a good deal somewhere? No, it is not. It is wrong, it is un-American, and it is undermining the whole concept of Medicare.

The idea that all seniors put their money into the pot, nobody sits around

in this country and says, gee, I hope I get sick so I can use some money out of the pot. There is nobody that crazy in our country. Everybody wants insurance there when they are sick and particularly they want to feel independent, they have taken care of it themselves. It is not their children that have to do it or their grandchildren.

My father died a couple of years ago at 93. My mother is 93, and we four kids in my family have not had to spend anything on our mother's health or our father's health. Like every American, we pay our taxes into the pot, and they have taken out when they needed to; and that has gone on over the entire country.

What they are saying in this bill is send your mother out and let her pick her own plan. That is wrong; and as we watch this debate, understand that is what they are saying to every senior citizen. Here is your money; good luck, Grandma; I hope you find something for yourself.

I hope every Member votes ''no'' on this. We could do better than this.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for yielding to me, and I want to thank him for claiming the time.

I rise tonight to talk about an issue where we have had a lot of discussion so far tonight. We have had a lot of discussion during this entire legislative session. In fact, we have had a lot of discussion for a number of years, and that is the issue of the price that Americans pay for prescription drugs relative to the rest of the industrialized world; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) was good enough to join us in what really is an overwhelming majority of Members of the House who voted on this issue earlier this year.

It all started several years ago for me when I went to a town hall meeting in Faribault, Minnesota, and there were a lot of seniors there; and they were talking about their trips up to Canada to save some money on prescription drugs. It was a little like a Nolan Ryan fastball. It just blew right by me, and I guess I decided if they wanted to go to Canada to buy their drugs, that is fine by me; and I never thought much about the issue.

They continued to pester me about this, saying things like, why is it we as seniors are treated like common criminal, just because we are trying to save a few bucks on prescription drugs; and still I did not pay much attention to the issue until something totally unrelated happened.

The price of pigs collapsed. Live hogs dropped from about $37 per hundred weight down to about $7, and we produce a lot of hogs in my part of the world. My pork producers kept calling me saying, Congressman, can you not do something about this; and so I called the Secretary of Commerce, and I called the Secretary of Agriculture. I got essentially the same answer. I should finish the story. What they really complained about was all of these Canadian hogs coming across our borders making our supply-and-demand situation even worse, and they said can you not do something at least about all these Canadian hogs.

I called the Secretary of Agriculture, called the Secretary of Commerce, got essentially the same answer. They said, well, that is NAFTA. That is free trade. We cannot stop the Canadian hogs from coming in, and all of a sudden a lightbulb went on over my head, and I said, wait a minute, you mean we have free markets and free trades when it comes to pork bellies, but not when it comes to Prilosec? I think the Secretary of Commerce sort of chuckled and said, well, I guess that is right.

That is when I began this little crusade of mine, and I began to study this issue even more, and Mr. Speaker, the more I have learned, the more I realized we in Congress need to do something about this because we created this environment. Unlike some of my friends on the left, I usually do not spend a whole lot of time saying shame on the pharmaceutical companies. I say shame on us because essentially we have created an environment that they are taking advantage of. We protect them like no other product from foreign competition, but let me talk first about the differences between what we pay in the United States versus what they pay in the rest of the industrialized world.

Let me give my colleagues some examples. We were in Munich, Germany, earlier this year; and we purchased 10 of the most commonly prescribed prescription drugs off the shelf at the Munich airport pharmacy, and here are some of the prices we paid.

We bought 10 tablets of Cipro, 250 milligrams for $35.12 American. That same product here in Washington, D.C., is $55. We bought Coumadin. That is a drug my father takes. It is a blood thinner that was developed at the University of Wisconsin. The generic version is called Warfarin. It actually is a rat poison. We bought it in Germany, 100 tablets, 5 milligrams for $21. That same package of drugs here in the United States, same product, made by the same company, under the same FDA approval, sells here in the United States not for $21 but for $89.95.

Glucophage, a miracle drug for diabetes, a drug that we purchased in Germany, 30 tablets, 850 milligrams, $5 in Germany, $29.95.

Pravachol, Prozac, Synthroid, all the same story. Come down here to this one, and this is the one that really gets to my gizzard, and that is the issue of the anticancer drugs, where we, American taxpayers, have paid so much to develop these drugs. Tamoxifen, we bought, in fact the actual number, we rounded it off here. It was $59.05 for 60 tablets, 20 milligrams of Tamoxifen. An amazing drug, a miracle drug in terms of the treatment of breast cancer. That same drug we checked here in Washington, D.C., local pharmacy, $360, six times more in the United States. Here is what really chaps my hide.

American taxpayers paid to develop that drug. As a matter of fact, through the NIH we paid to take that drug all the way through phrase two trials. The American taxpayer paid to take that drug through phase two trials, and then we licensed it to one of the pharmaceutical companies, and they sell it back to us.

Clearly, we ought to pay our fair share of the cost of research. I think we ought to subsidize the people in sub-Saharan Africa, but I do not think the American taxpayers and the American consumers should have to subsidize the starving Swiss or the starving Germans. It really is time for them to pay their fair share.

Mr. Speaker, we have to ask is it really fair to make American consumers pay six times more for a drug that they paid to develop and take through phase two trials? This story goes on.

If we look down here at Zoloft, $82.52 in Germany, $132.95 for American consumers and the story goes on; and some people say, well, that is because in some countries they fix the prices. They have price controls. In some respects that is true, but it is not always true.

For example, in Great Britain, the pharmaceutical companies can sell their drugs for whatever they want. There are no price controls in Great Britain. That is according to a report that was done and paid for by the Pharmaceutical Association in Europe, done, we have a copy of it in my office; and if any Member would like a copy, they can just call and we will send them a copy. Essentially what they do in Great Britain is they can charge whatever they want, but the British medical plan will only reimburse so much for these drugs, and they found that consumers in Great Britain have a tremendous amount of resistance to paying huge co-pays.

I have a drug here, Cipro, a marvelous drug. We bought this in Germany, $35 in Germany, $55 here in the

United States, and my colleagues do not have to take my word for it. They do not have to just take my word for it now. More and more of the media are actually doing their own research, and here is another copy and Members can get a copy of this by going to my office, calling my office. I think we may even have this on our Web site. There is one done by USA Today. This was done by the Associated Press; and I will not bore my colleagues with all the numbers, but they are exactly the same, and they compare the prices.

For example, Lipitor in the United States, the best price they could find online in the U.S., 10 milligrams, 90 tablets each, Lipitor, $207.99. One can buy that drug in Canada, the online price, $132.07. Paxil, $80.99 in the United States, $40.80 in Canada; and those stories go on and on. Vioxx, an amazing drug. I guess it is an antirheumatoid-type drug. Fortunately, I do not have to take it yet, but it is $85.99 in the United States. It is only $36.17 in Canada.

But the real issue is, why is it that the world's best customers pay the world's highest prices? That is a fair question. It seems to me we as policymakers for the United States of America ought to ask that question, and we ought to demand better answers.

I want to come back to something I mentioned earlier; and I had the Congressional Research Service do a little research for me, and I asked is there any other product class that you can think of where we provide so much protection from competition from the same product from abroad? They went through and they did some research, and in fact, I will just read from what the CRS says, and they are our official researcher. I will quote. It said: ''We have been unable to locate any statutory provisions similar in language and structure to the one in the Food and Drug Cosmetic Act.'' In other words, nobody enjoys that kind of protection.

Matter of fact, they went even further. They said: ''As indicated above, our research has uncovered no other statute that contains language similar to that in section 381(d),'' and this is the interesting thing. Even heavily regulated industries such as chemicals, pollutants and munitions are not apparently subject to the statutory provisions limiting reimportation of the product to its original manufacturer.

□ 2115

In other words, there is no other product class.

Now, some people say, well, safety. It is all about safety. We want to protect the consumers. Members, understand this, we keep incredibly good records in terms of how many people have become seriously ill or died from taking drugs from other countries. The FDA keeps those records and the CDC keeps those records. As far as we can determine, and this is under testimony that was given in front of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform, and it is an easy number to remember, it is zero. It is a nice round number.

Now, you contrast that to how many people get very ill and die every year from food-borne pathogens. Now, it is the Food and Drug Administration, and yet for some unknown reason, some reason unknown to me, we have set, for things like Cipro, we have set the bar impossibly high. We have an absolutist standard. But when it comes to fruits and vegetables, we barely even look at them when they come into the country.

The bottom line is you can get just as sick, as a matter of fact you can die, from food-borne pathogens. By their own studies, the FDA acknowledges that 2 percent of the fruits and vegetables that come into the United States every day, 2 percent of them, are contaminated with food-borne pathogens, including things like salmonella. My colleagues, if you get salmonella, and particularly if you have any other kind of medical problem going on in your system at that time, you can die.

We know, for example, in the last 2 years, that 2,264 Americans have become seriously ill from eating raspberries from Guatemala. Do we stop raspberries from Guatemala from coming in today? I do not think so. Forty percent of the orange juice that Americans consume comes from other countries, and yet it comes right in. They say, well, gee whiz, somebody might get in there and contaminate the drug supply. What about contaminating the orange juice supply? It seems to me we have this ridiculous measure when it comes to safety for prescription drugs and virtually no measure when it comes to our food supply.

Now, I am not saying we need to have a much stronger implementation of a security system for fruits and vegetables, but it seems to me if you are going to have one standard for fruits and vegetables and another standard for prescription drugs, at least we, as public policymakers, ought to demand some kind of a rationale from the Food and Drug Administration.

Now, the bill we are going to probably consider here at the end of the week does nothing about allowing Americans to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices, and I think that is a terrible mistake. Because I think, here in Washington, we have spent so much time talking about coverage, we have to find ways to get people coverage for prescription drug benefits, that we have missed the big picture. The issue is not so much about coverage. Every senior in America qualifies to buy prescription drug coverage. They can buy it through the AARP. Prescription drug coverage is available in lots of ways from lots of sources. The issue is not coverage, the issue is affordability. And that is the tragic problem with the bill that we will consider later this week, and that is that it does precious little to deal with affordability.

Now, the sponsors are going to say, well, wait a second, Congressman GUTKNECHT, we are going to create these systems, sort of like the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, and that is going to bring down and hold down the price of prescription drugs. Well, we have some evidence of just how well the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan does in terms of lowering the cost of prescription drugs. Let me give some examples.

For example, the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan that services Federal employees, they do get a discount on Coumadin. I mentioned here that Coumadin, at the retail price in the United States, can be $90, or $89.95. Well, the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan does not pay $89.95. They get a discount. They buy it for $55.31. The Mail Handlers Plan, however, does not get their drugs for $55, they pay $72.24. My colleagues, you can buy that same drug off the shelf in Munich, Germany, at the Munich Airport pharmacy, for $21. In other words, the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan pays more than double what the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Federal Employees Benefit Plan does.

And it goes on. Take Glucophage. We talked about Glucophage. Well, this is in a different quantity. We are talking about a larger prescription. But the Glucophage they are buying using the Federal Employees Benefit Plan, they buy it for $90 for the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan. The Mail Handlers pay $118. The HMO plan, they get a heck of a deal, they buy it for $18.30. But you can buy it right off the shelf in Germany for $22 for that exact same drug.

And the story goes on with all of the plans. And Members, do not take my word for it. This is information that was done by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and his subcommittee staff, where they did some comparisons about what we pay even through the Federal Employees Benefit Plan versus prices off the shelf in Canada, in Europe, and other industrialized countries. And the answer is that in every category we pay a lot more, even with the discounts that we get for the Federal employees.

As I say, I think we ought to pay our fair share, and I believe research is important. I am vice president of the Committee on Science, and I am proud of the fact we Americans represent 6 percent of the world's population, but we represent over half of the basic research done in the world. That is important. And I think it is important that the pharmaceutical companies continue to do that kind of research. But I think Members have to understand that we subsidize that research here in the United States in three separate ways.

First of all, we subsidize it through the Tax Code. Now, when these pharmaceutical companies say, well, we spend so much on research, well, you might just ask them how much are you able to write-off on your Federal tax forms? And if you do business in Puerto Rico, how much Federal income tax do you pay? And in addition to that, is

it not true over the last 10 years you have taken over $28 billion in investment tax credits for the research that you do; for research and development tax credits? So you add it up, and the net real cost to the pharmaceutical industry is much less than they sometimes say.

And, incidentally, more and more independent groups, bipartisan groups, nonpartisan groups are coming to the same conclusion, and that is that the pharmaceutical industry is now spending more money on marketing and advertising, in fact, in some cases some companies dramatically more on marketing and advertising than they are for research. So research is important, but we pay for it through the Tax Code. We subsidize it through the Tax Code.

We subsidize it also in the amount that we spend on research. I mentioned that I am proud of the fact that we finance an awful lot of research with taxpayers' dollars here in Washington. This year we will spend upwards of $27 billion through the NIH, the CDC, even the Department of Defense on research projects which will directly or indirectly benefit the pharmaceutical industry.

And then, finally, of course, the way we subsidize them is in the prices we pay. I think once is enough. I think once we help to develop Taxoxiphen, we ought to at least be able to buy it at world market prices for American consumers.

This is a huge issue, my colleagues. And it is one that more and more seniors, and not only seniors but American consumers in general understand this issue. And I think there is a feeling here that if we just pass this prescription drug benefit plan that somehow this will go away. Well, Members, you need to understand a few things about, ultimately, the facts about this prescription drug benefit. And I am not here to criticize the Medicare reforms, I think most of the Medicare reforms we are talking about in this bill are very good, very necessary, and perhaps even overdue. But when you start talking about the prescription drug benefit, I hope you will understand, at least from my perspective, the facts:

First of all, this bill, they purport, is going to cost $400 billion. I think it is going to be a lot more than $400 billion, because we do not have effective ways of dealing with the cost, we are going to pay in the affordability of these drugs. But let us say it is $400 billion. Well, the CBO tells us virtually every dollar of that is going to have to be borrowed. To pay for this new entitlement, we are literally going to have to borrow the money from our kids and grandkids. In some respects, I think that is a terrible tragedy.

But as we look at the overall issue, what is going to happen is next year, by the time people begin to understand this, they are going to say, now, wait a second, and whether it is going to be 16 percent or 36 percent, no one really knows, but we do know this, there will be people who have prescription drug coverage today, through their former employers, who are going to be pushed off of the system and all of a sudden they are going to be thrown into this new government plan, and what they are going to find out is it is not as generous as the plan that they had through their former employer, for the most part. And they are not going to be happy.

I think a lot of conservatives and taxpayers are not going to be happy when they see the cost of this. And I think as they look at the final issue, if next year they look at the system and say, wait a second, you mean even after this, we are still going to be spending $360, or some number, let us say we get a 15 percent discount or a 20 percent discount off $360, that is roughly a $72 discount, that gets the prices down to about $290. That still is a lot more than they are paying in Europe for the same drugs.

No, I think Americans should pay their fair share. I think we are paying our fair share. But I think if we pass this bill later this week without dealing with the fundamental cause, or one of the fundamental drivers of this whole debate in affordability, it seems to me we are making a huge mistake. And it is one I think the voters will not be appreciative of once they begin to realize.

Yes, we need to reform Medicare. We have 50 million baby boomers moving on their way towards retirement. And it is inevitable that as we go forward, we have to do something about reforming the Medicare system. We have to make it fairer. We have to give consumers and seniors more choices. But if we are going to add a prescription drug benefit to the package, this new $400 billion entitlement, and going up in my opinion, then it seems to me we have an obligation to make sure American consumers, American taxpayers are getting their monies worth.

So I would hope that Members would at least pause and ask the question what are we going to do about opening up markets? What are we going to do to control the cost of these prescription drugs? What are we going to do to make them more affordable for American consumers? I think the answer ultimately to me is quite simple, and that is give the market access. Do what we do with those pig producers, require some competition across the border. Allow prescription drugs to work as virtually every other market does.

When markets work, when competition works, prices will level. And the net result is that we will pay considerably less in the United States. And some of the people in other industrialized countries are going to probably have to pay a little more. But that is the way markets work. They tend to level.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for giving me the chance to present some of these things tonight. I know that not everyone agrees with me. I try to be respectful when I debate and discuss these, but it is such an important issue. And if I could just close with one other point, because some people say this cannot be done safely.

Members, I would encourage you to take a look at the newest technology that exists today. This is not pie in the sky. I have the technology right here in this little vial literally about 100 computer clips. And within 2 years, most of the products being sold at Wal-Mart stores will have these on them. This is the new UPC codes. And these little computer chips in this vial, there are about 100 of them, they are so small you cannot see them, but they will be able to track that product literally so that you will know when it runs through the scanner that this Cipro was produced at the Munich, Germany, plant on September 3, 2001 at 1 p.m. in the afternoon and it is in fact Cipro.

So the idea that we do not have the technology to do this today is really laughable. It exists. It is being used on other products. It will expand and be used even more. But, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), I appreciate having the opportunity to present some of these things. If Members would like more information from my office or want to go to my Web site, simply go to gil.house.gov. We have some great charts which explain this.

As John Adams said, ''Facts are stubborn things.'' This is a stubborn thing. This chart is not going to go away. And under the bill we are considering this week, it will not change much. Ultimately, we have the power to change it. The FDA works for us, not the other way around. It is not shame on the pharmaceutical industry, it is shame on us.

DECLINING MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT FOR PHYSICIANS

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today, as I have a number of times before, to call attention to declining Medicare reimbursements for physicians.

Effective January 1, 2004, physicians and other providers paid pursuant to the Medicare physician fee schedule, face at least a 4.5 percent cut in reimbursements.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, I have been outspoken on this issue and have described several instances in which the citizens of Georgia and our Nation will be negatively affected by this cut. There is a staffing issue within the trauma center at Grady Memorial Hospital in Atlanta.

Dr. Harry Sherman in Augusta is contemplating retirement due to a lack of adequate Medicare reimbursement and the high cost of liability premiums. And more specifically, I demonstrated the decreasing reimbursement for, and thus the eventual reduction in access to very common procedures provided to Medicare recipients.

I would like to bring the attention of my colleagues to a survey conducted by the American Academy of Family Physicians. This survey is not necessarily scientific, but I believe it is indicative of the problem we are facing. AAFP found that 24 percent of family physicians no longer accept new Medicare patients. After the 4.5 percent cut was announced, AAFP surveyed again to find out what its members would do if the cut takes effect. As detailed in a release from the American Academy of Family Physicians, only 36 percent said they would take new Medicare patients if these new cuts occur.

Mr. Speaker, come January, doctors are going to take a cut in their reimbursement for treating our Nation's most needy individuals. There is an old saying, however, that the night is always darkest just before the dawn. With a physician-reimbursement disaster looming, Congress is on the verge of a breakthrough. Housed within the Medicare modernization bill is temporary relief for the medical community. House and Senate negotiators have announced an agreement that will potentially bring this legislation before the Congress this week. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the subcommittee chair, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and those from the other Chamber, such as Senators FRIST, GRASSLEY, BAUCUS and BREAUX, who have worked so hard to get us to where we are today.

I encourage all of those involved in this process to continue to act in the best interests of the American people, but especially our seniors and the medical community on which they so desperately depend. Let me be clear, as a physician Member of the United States House of Representatives, I believe that we must pass the Medicare conference report now. For nearly 40 years, Medicare has provided necessary health care to millions of patients across this country. Another steep cut in reimbursement rates would have been devastating for the physicians who care for Medicare patients; but with the language that has been crafted, the physician-reimbursement update would be a positive 1.5 percent.

This chart is representative of the positive impact the current Medicare legislation will have on Medicare providers throughout the country. For example, New York will see a benefit of $865 million; Washington State benefits $155 million; Texas, $641 million; and most important to me and my colleagues from Georgia, our State will benefit $254 million. All 50 States will see a positive impact from the current version of the Medicare conference report.

I cannot overstate the importance of just this one piece of the overall Medicare bill. It is my hope this will allow for the continued access to quality health care for our seniors. I am proud that as the door was slamming shut on our seniors' health care, this Congress stood up, and will stand up, in a bipartisan fashion and hold this door open.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest achievements of the Medicare program is the access to high-quality care it has brought to our Nation's seniors and disabled patients. This level of access is more likely to continue in light of this temporary fix. This legislation will allow Congress and the Center for Medicare Services the time to work together to finally find a more permanent solution by revamping the Medicare payment formula.

Doctors are the linchpin of the Medicare program. Let me say that a prescription drug plan is no benefit at all unless there are physicians willing to accept Medicare patients and to write those prescriptions. We need to pass this conference report and pass it now.

IRAQ WATCH

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

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight with my colleagues to resume the Iraq Watch we have been conducting almost every week on the floor since sometime last spring. I believe it was April that we started speaking every week on the floor about our concerns about our policies in Iraq, trying to ask questions, trying to seek answers from the administration regarding the policies that we have been pursuing. Also, we have been suggesting changes that we would like to see in those policies. Of course, a lot has happened in Iraq since last spring, since the very impressive and brave work of our military men and women, the impressive victory that they won over Saddam Hussein, a victory no one thought was in doubt, but everyone was happy to see with minimal loss of life. We thought that the military performed with great courage and great skill.

Since that time, of course, it has become clear as the military battle was conducted, the planning for and the actual reconstruction and security of Iraq has been very poor. We have all been disappointed in the difficulties. The continuing casualties have been heartbreaking. The inability to get the American-appointed Governing Council to work effectively to try to bring the Iraqi society together has been disappointing. I think the Bush administration finally understands they need to change their plan for the ultimate creation of a new government and a representative democracy and hopefully a pluralistic society in Iraq.

Recently the administration has announced a change. They will no longer ask that the Governing Council in Iraq be responsible for writing a new constitution and holding new elections before America gives up authority for the reconstruction and the occupation of Iraq.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we are now putting time limits on our occupation. We have apparently announced that we will give to the Iraqis the responsibility for their reconstruction next summer, although the President has been clear, and I agree with the President that we must continue to keep our forces there to make sure the tyrants and the murderers do not come back if the Iraqi democrats-to-be fail to move forward and secure their country.

The question is what is the best policy for this country? How do we best achieve a stable and secure Iraq, which is a goal all of us share? How do we best achieve the creation of a pluralistic society? How do we best establish a representative government based upon principles of self-government and tolerance and cooperation with the rights of women protected, with sharing of responsibility between the three great ethnic groups in Iraq, the Sunnis, the Shiites and the Kurds? How do we best achieve this in the face of a security threat in Iraq where our troops are not safe, where the guerilla attacks against our troops continue, where there is no Iraqi Army yet ready to step forward to provide for its own security, where the Iraqi police are not yet capable of providing for security domestically? How do we best proceed?

Some fear that the President after holding on to power and not allowing the Iraqi Governing Council or any other group to have any decision-making power, some fear that the President now is moving too quickly to give up power to the Iraqis; and I think it is a very legitimate question because if we leave too early, if we leave a vacuum in any way in Iraq, only bad things can happen, whether Saddam Hussein or his followers attempt to come back, whether a new group of lawless thugs attempt to take over, whether forces from other countries attempt to infiltrate and take over Iraq, none of that would be good. None of that would be good for the Western democracies; none of that would honor the sacrifices that brave young Americans have made, including those who have made the ultimate sacrifice and have died serving their country.

A premature departure from Iraq by this country could lead to a less stable country in Iraq. It could lead to a less stable Middle East. It could allow Iraq to become a haven for terrorists, which is a process, unfortunately, already under way, a haven which did not exist when Saddam Hussein was in power. As murderous a tyrant as he was, he operated in a secular fashion and did not

apparently have relationships with the religious fundamentalists and extremists that form al Qaeda and other terrorist groups. But now with the instability in Iraq, it has become a magnet for those who want to attack Americans and disrupt the search for peace in the Middle East.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, the way to best achieve our national goals in Iraq is to recognize that while this country is uniquely capable of winning military victories and facing down tyrants and working for the liberation of oppressed people, we are perhaps not best suited for nation-building; that we are probably not using our resources and our skills to our highest potential when we get bogged down in having to administer a country. It is admirable that we are willing to pay for the reconstruction or some of the reconstruction of a nation, and that is a great and wonderful American tradition of rebuilding vanquished foes and those less fortunate. But how do we best achieve this stabilized society, representative government and the creation of a pluralistic society where tolerance and economic freedom and personal liberty can flourish?

I am here tonight to say that I continue to believe that we should turn to our multinational organizations such as the United Nations, NATO, and others, to help us with nation-building in Iraq. I would point out that the United Nations is perhaps uniquely qualified through experience and organization to be responsible for reconstruction and nation-building.

In fact, this is what the United Nations was created to do in 1945. I fear that an almost irrational opposition to the notion and the concept of the United Nations from some on the other side of the aisle is preventing this country from calling upon the United Nations to assume this burden. There are many reasons why I would like to see this happen. It is not only to get out from under the financial burden of reconstructing Iraq on our own. It is partly that; it is also partly to share the responsibility for the reconstruction of Iraq. It is to share the credibility that is needed, to call upon other nations and multilateral organizations like the United Nations to provide the stability and take away from the equation some of the animosity that has wrongfully built up against America, but nonetheless exists in some part of the world.

□ 2145

Frankly, the United Nations is designed to do this kind of work. It is designed to relieve the United States from taking on all of the burden of reconstructing a country and building a new Nation. If we turn to the United Nations, we will still be the senior partner. We pay 25 percent of the bills of the United Nations. We will still have tremendous influence over what happens, but we would be in a position where the responsibility and accountability and the burden of reconstruction would be shared with an organization that is created to do that very thing.

Secondly, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that anyone, the United States, the United Nations, or anyone else, will have success in the stabilization of Iraq, not the least of which I would include the Iraqi Governing Council itself, unless we establish security in Iraq, and that has not been done. Again, I think it is asking too much of our American military to become a long-term occupying power, to have our young men and women serving in what, in parts of Iraq, seems to be, literally, a shooting gallery, with 20 or 25 daily attacks on American Forces and our Coalition Forces. We are not in a position to have secured Iraq. We clearly need more troops to do that. Yet, in my view, it should not be America's burden to send more troops.

So I would say that it is by far the best strategy to turn to NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is a military organization, to provide security in Iraq. NATO, of course, historically never fired a shot, was designed as a defensive alliance to keep the world safe from any hostility from the Soviet Union. In the conflict in Kosovo, the NATO forces were used for the first time out of the traditional confines of Europe, or at least on the southern stretches of Europe, used for the first time in a proactive way to defeat another tyrant, another dictator, Milosevic, in Kosovo. And NATO performed brilliantly and was able to liberate that country from the abuses of that dictator and has also now moved into Afghanistan to take over some of the security functions in that country. I believe that NATO would be the appropriate international organization to provide security in Iraq while we turn to the United Nations to take primary responsibility for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Now, none of this will happen, Mr. Speaker, none of this will happen until the United States is willing to give up some authority in Iraq. We cannot continue to call all of the shots in Iraq and expect our traditional allies to send troops or money or advice or anything else. It is time for us not just to put Iraqis back in charge, because it is not yet clear Iraqis are able to be back in charge, particularly, with the insecure conditions that exist there; but it is time for us, in concert with our traditional allies, in concert with international organizations that we created at the end of the Second World War, that we established for the very purpose of Nation-building. Nation-building was not a phrase then, it is a newer phrase, but the concept is exactly why NATO was established, and, particularly, why the United Nations was established. It is time for us to use our diplomatic skill to give up the necessary authority and responsibility, to share the obligations with these two international organizations, so that we can more quickly and more effectively and more safely stabilize Iraq, establish a pluralistic society, and move them towards self-government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), one of the senior members of the House Committee on International Relations and a founding member of Iraq Watch, my good friend.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is good to be here with my colleague tonight and share a few observations regarding this situation in Iraq. Also, I think at some point in time, I think it is necessary to present some information to the American people and to those who are listening here tonight relative to what is transpiring in Afghanistan.

I think to sum up what the gentleman said, one only has to look at the cover of the November 3 edition of Newsweek magazine, and it is entitled, ''Bush's $87 Billion Mess. Waste, Chaos, and Cronyism. The Real Cost of Rebuilding Iraq.''

It has become a matter of concern, as the gentleman well knows, not only to Members on this side of the aisle, Democrats, but clearly to our colleagues on the Republican side, particularly in the United States Senate, because if there is any term that best characterizes what is occurring, it is chaos.

Mr. Speaker, in our previous efforts in terms of Iraq Watch, we discussed the lack of post-major combat phase planning. And again, that opinion was shared by many, most specifically, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, RICHARD LUGAR who, in fact, had written an article that I thought was very incisive and appeared in the Washington Post. But not only do we not have a plan, but the plan seems to change almost on a daily basis.

If my colleagues remember, I think it was, in fact, a colleague of ours here in the House, a senior Republican Member of the House Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), highly-regarded and well-respected by all Members, who implored the President to establish, once and for all, who is in charge of whatever plan may or may not exist out there. Initially, Jay Garner, a former general, was dispatched to Iraq to work with Iraqis that were favorably disposed to the United States to begin the process of rebuilding. And, after a relatively short period of time, there was a change there. And L. Paul Bremer became, if you will, the viceroy of Iraq. Mr. Bremer indicated that his boss to whom he reported directly was the Secretary of Defense Mr. Rumsfeld. Yet, several months thereafter, there was an announcement from the White House that in fact it was the National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, who was vested with the responsibility of coordinating the plan for Iraq. Of course, recently we learn that Mr.

Bremer, because of the deteriorating situation in Iraq, either reached out or was summonsed by the White House for a special meeting directly with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that there be one individual that can be held accountable, other than the President, for the shaping of this policy that means so much to the American people with our sons and daughters tragically dying there on an all-too-frequent basis, and to the American taxpayers who were asked by this White House to appropriate some $87 billion on top of the $79 billion that we have already spent in Iraq to create security in Iraq and to rebuild Iraq, if you will, to reconstruct Iraq. Many of us on this side of the aisle were adamantly opposed, primarily based on the fact that this money was not in the form of a loan, but was a gift to Iraq, a nation with incredible resources, some of the largest reserves in terms of energy anywhere in the world, second only to Saudi Arabia. And hopefully, at some time in the not-too-distant future, would clearly be able to repay the American taxpayers for the sacrifices that they are making now while we are dealing with these burgeoning deficits that will at some point in time be a severe drag on our economy.

But not only do we have a confusion in terms of who is in charge, but we have had a series of different plans. It would appear now that the most recent plan is what I would describe as the French plan, the plan that France suggested would be the most fruitful initiative in terms of bringing stability and rebuilding Iraq. I find that rather ironic, given our recent rather divisive relationship with France.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman refers to the latest plan as the French plan. The New York Times on Sunday, in looking at the plan that they characterize as throwing the problem to the Iraqis, called it the ''hot potato plan.'' French, hot potato french fries perhaps, whatever.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, maybe this was a hot french fries plan; I honestly do not know.

I notice we have been joined by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), our friend, who is also a member of our Iraq Watch group. But I think what is difficult to accept is that what we have now achieved is the expenditure of billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money. Of course, the White House made note of the fact that there were other international donors in a conference in Madrid. But what I thought was particularly noticeable in Madrid was that not a single donor there, with the exception of the Japanese, provided gifts, outright grants like this institution did and like this White House did, but no, they decided they would loan the money so that their people would be repaid rather than our people who are carrying the entire burden.

But here we are, we have suffered, and let us be very candid and frank: We have suffered a loss of prestige all over the world. One only has to turn to nightly news shows. Leading the news now are the preparations in Great Britain for the visit of our President, President Bush who, according to the most recent polls is viewed negatively by our ally, the English people, by 60 percent. Sixty percent of the English people disapprove of President Bush. Whether one is a Democrat or whether one is a Republican, that is painful to us. That is painful to us. We do not wish our President to be viewed as negative by our ally. And recently during the course of a hearing on the Subcommittee on Latin America, data was put forward that 87 percent of our neighbors here in this hemisphere disapprove of our President. Again, that pains us all.

□ 2200

That pains us all.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) again?

There was additional polling information made available over the weekend from a European pollster, I do not know the name, saying that a majority of citizens in virtually every European country except, I believe, Italy, view the United States as the most likely country to start a war or to create instability. Now, I reject that view completely. We are the peacemakers and we are not the war makers; but I wanted to emphasize the gentleman's point that something has gone wrong with the way we are viewed by our friends around the world, let alone how we are viewed by our enemies. I am not so concerned about how the enemies look at us, but when the Western European democracies have a negative view of our President and our country, a negative view that I do not share, but that they have come to that conclusion, something is dramatically wrong.

Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) mind if we bring our colleague into the conversation?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would welcome our friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be with you this evening. I was asked a few days ago by a reporter in my district why the emphasis on what has gone wrong in Iraq. The question was phrased in this way: Should you not be concerned about the future and what we do next? And my response was this: The same people who are in charge of planning for the future are the people who have gotten us to the point where we are now. And unless we look at how we got into this situation, unless we scrutinize the decision-makers who brought us to this point, we cannot have confidence that we are being taken in the right direction as far as the future is concerned.

If I could just say a word about the $87 billion that my friend referred to earlier. I think the American people need to know that if we were to take the 435 congressional districts in this country, and we were to divide $87 billion by the 435 congressional districts, what we would come out with is $200 million that could be spent in every congressional district in this country for the needs that exist back home, for the jobless people, for the children who do not have health care, for the older people who do not have prescription drugs.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And, Mr. Speaker, for our veterans.

Mr. STRICKLAND. For our veterans. And that leads me to the fact that we are underfunding veterans health care by $1.8 billion. $1.8 billion. We are sending $87 billion to Iraq in addition to what we have already spent this year, and we are being so stingy with our veterans that we are underfunding their health care by $1.8 billion.

And the American people need to know that over in the Senate they passed an amendment to add an additional $1.3 billion of that $1.8 billion shortfall. And the very day that amendment passed the Senate, the White House put out a statement opposing it. Now, think of that. Here we have a President, we have a President who has asked for $87 billion for Iraq and takes active opposition toward the efforts in this Congress to give an additional $1.8 billion to our veterans. I mean, I think that is shocking; I think it is something the American people would object to. And they need to know about that.

But I want to talk about one other thing, if I can, in regard to this war effort, and it is something that I have talked about and I think others have talked about on this floor before. But it is something that the American people need to know about. As our soldiers continue to die on a daily basis in Iraq, I think Americans have a right to ask for answers from the President, from our Secretary of Defense, from the Pentagon: Why do all of our troops who are fighting for us this very moment in Iraq not have the best protective armor available? When will this armor be available to all of our soldiers? Why were soldiers sent into battle with these cheap, Vietnam-era flak jackets that are not capable of stopping bullets?

I have asked the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, to provide answers as to how many American soldiers have been killed or have been seriously wounded in part because they were not adequately protected. And I have asked the Secretary to commit that we will not provide this protection to foreign troops until every, every American soldier in harm's way is so protected.

Somebody needs to be held accountable for this. We had months to prepare for this war, months during which we knew we were likely to be sending young Americans into harm's way. And yet we did so without giving them this protection. Somebody ought to be held

responsible. Either the President or Secretary Rumsfeld or some lower-level individual apparently made the decision that this was not a priority. And I believe American soldiers have lost their lives because of this failure to plan, failure to set appropriate priorities. And who is going to be helped accountable, and when is the situation going to be altered?

Americans need to know that as we sit in our homes and watch TV, and those of us who work in this Chamber are here, we carry out our daily lives, that there are young Americans over there in tanks and in Humvees and walking patrols that do not have the most basic protection, this body armor that is capable of stopping bullets. Why do they not have that protection?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) yield for just a moment.

I met with families of Reservists and National Guard, military that are serving in Iraq currently. They have been trained as a transportation unit. They are now serving in a different role that exposes them to great danger. They are using their own equipment, trucks that have no armor protection, that are open, that leave these men and women on the back of what I would call a large pickup vehicle as a sitting target. These families were outraged. One actually had to go to a military hardware store, presumably, to purchase for their son a $900 kevlar suit because the parents simply could not sleep at night. And it cost that family $400 to send it via the United States Post Office.

Mr. STRICKLAND. General Myers and others have been widely quoted in the press as saying this is not a money problem; it is a supply problem. Well, it is a supply problem because this war was under way for almost 7 months before the first request came to this Congress for resources to provide this protection. But even beyond that, I got a call in my office, week before last, from a company that told me they had 30,000 of these plates in stock, plates that meet specifications. Because they say they also provide them to our Army Rangers.

I do not know how those responsible can sleep at night. They ought to stay up until they solve this problem.

I just met with a young soldier back in my district who was wounded by shrapnel. He told me that he sees no way that this Pentagon commitment to have these vests delivered to all of our troops by December is going to be possible. He says there are thousands of troops over there without this most basic protection.

Now, how can we trust these people to tell us what is the best course of action for the future of this war in Iraq when they have been so incompetent and negligent in providing our troops with this most basic protection?

Mr. DELAHUNT. And yet, Mr. Speaker, they would criticize those who ask those questions and instead put forth, if you will, a PR campaign to say what is right in Iraq. But it is time, I believe, to listen to the troops who give us insight. We all know, for example, because we travel abroad and oftentimes we visit our troops, that these trips are very carefully structured so that only those things the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense wants us to hear is provided us.

If I could just indulge my two friends for a moment. Back in mid-October there was a report in The Washington Post and it is entitled, ''Many Troops Dissatisfied, Iraq Poll Finds.'' A broad survey of U.S. troops in Iraq found that half of those questioned described their unit's morale as low and their training as insufficient and said they do not plan to reenlist. Now, this was not a poll conducted by The Washington Post or the New York Times, or the Los Angeles Times or the Boston Globe. It was a poll that was conducted by the Stars and Stripes newspaper, a newspaper funded by our Pentagon, our Department of Defense.

The findings, if I can just go on, the findings drawn from 1,900 questionnaires presented to U.S. servicemembers throughout Iraq conflict with statements by military commanders and Bush administration officials that portray the deployed troops as highly spirited and generally well prepared. Though not obtained through scientific methods, the survey results indicate that prolonged tours in Iraq are wearing down a significant portion of the U.S. force and threatening to provoke a sizable exodus from military service. And yet the paper quotes General Sanchez, commander of the U.S. forces in Iraq, saying in a September 9 interview for this particular series, ''There is no moral problem.''

Of course, as we know, the Bush administration has launched this campaign. But the Stars and Stripes, the military's paper, raised questions about what visiting dignitaries, such as us and our other colleagues who have visited Iraq, get to see. Let me quote again from the Stars and Stripes: ''Many soldiers, including several officers, allege that VIP visits from the Pentagon and Capitol Hill are only given hand-picked troops to meet with during their tours of Iraq,'' the newspaper said in its interview with General Sanchez.

The phrase ''dog and pony show'' is usually used. Some troops even go so far as to say they have been ordered not to talk to VIPs because leaders are afraid of what they might say.

Let me say it is about time for the unvarnished truth to be presented to the American people. And that is what we attempt to do during the course of this hour, of which we have had many.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if I could just say a word about the troops. I spent some time last weekend with two young soldiers from my district, both of whom have been wounded, and they have come back for medical treatment. They are good, loyal, patriotic soldiers. They are going to do their duty. They care about Iraq. They care about the Iraqi people. They care about the final outcome in that country. The problem is not with our troops. These are wonderful young Americans who are simply doing what they are called upon to do. And they are doing it well.

The problem, as I see it, exists with the decision-makers, those who sit here in the safety of the offices in Washington D.C. and elsewhere and make decisions which affect real lives. I had breakfast in a restaurant in Ohio a couple of weekends ago. As I was finishing my breakfast, I struck up a conversation with a young woman sitting in a booth next to me. She was leaving Ohio as soon as she finished her breakfast and driving to Baltimore to meet her husband, who is stationed in Africa and who is coming home, who is coming home for a 2-week leave. And then she told me that she had just gotten her orders and she is being deployed to Iraq. The children are going to be taken care of by the grandparents.

□ 2215

I just share that with you to emphasize the fact that we are talking about real people, real mothers and dads, real sweethearts, real sons and daughters. These are real Americans, and decisions are being made to expose them to the most incredible danger.

The question is, is this war being pursued in a way that is rationale and reasonable? I still wish that this President, this administration would go to the world community, would seek out the help that we need, would internationalize the effort in Iraq, would stop our soldiers being the only targets basically.

We hear talk about a coalition. Let us face it. There are a handful basically of coalition forces in Iraq. Most of the young people there are being killed and injured and shot at are American troops; and we need to internationalize our effort, spread this responsibility and not just simply allow our kids, our children for the next, no one knows for sure. The most recent estimate I have heard is that at least for 5 years our troops are likely to be there, and I just do not think the American people want this to continue as it is unfolding before our eyes. Every day we see it happening.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. The problem is not with our troops. It is with the policymakers and our planners here in Washington.

I referred earlier to the New York Times article this Sunday. They entitled it ''Iraq Goes Sour.'' And I take issue, actually, with one of the claims they make here. They blame the intelligence agencies for the failures to understand what was actually happening in Iraq. The editorial said, for example, the Central Intelligence Agency we now realize had no idea what was going on inside Iraq. They continue, the CIA's estimate regarding weapons of

mass destruction were basically worst-case scenarios of what the Hussein regime might have been up to in the interim, in 1998 when inspections were cut off.

They continue, that was apparently a mistake, if an understandable one. The reality I think is different. I think that while the intelligence agencies clearly did not get it right, they were telling the policymakers last fall before Congress voted on whether or not to authorize the war, they were telling the White House that there was great uncertainty about what Hussein had and what he did not have. We know that now. We did not know it then.

This past Spring, 6 months after we voted, and after the war was fought and won, at least according to the President's proclamation on May 1, at least the military's battle was won, if not the guerilla battle. The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence made available to rank and file members 18 or 20 boxes of intelligence information, most notably the Defense Intelligence Agency report of September 2002. And then the great summary report the national intelligence estimate of October of 2002. And I have read the executive summaries of those documents. It is very long, and I spent a couple of hours reading it. It would take days to read all of those boxes, but those summaries which are still classified are replete with uncertainties, with the agencies saying, well, we believe he has got this. We believe he has got that but we are not sure. He had this amount of weapons in the past and we are not quite sure where they are today.

They have made the case, as the Vice President has said, that Hussein was trying to do certain things, but they were full of uncertainty. And my objection is none of that uncertainty was communicated to Congress and to the American people. The President and all of his people, and I want to give an example in a second, told us with complete clarity and certainty that Hussein had these weapons. We knew where they were. We knew how much they weighed. We knew everything about them. We were going to get them and we could not trust him for another moment. And it is my view that it is not the intelligence agencies that failed, but the politicians.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I cannot agree more. Ironically, in this week's edition of Newsweek magazine, there is an article that I would commend to all of our colleagues here in the House and to the viewing audience here tonight. This is very important to read. As one can see, there is a picture of the Vice President on the cover. It is entitled, ''How Dick Cheney Sold the War. Why He Fell for Bad Intelligence and Pitched It to the President.''

The Central Intelligence Agency, I daresay, made a solid effort from what information now appears to be back in the public domain. I think it is safe to conclude that key players led by the Vice President, supported by Secretary Rumsfeld, and Under Secretary Wolfowitz, and Under Secretary Fife, cherry-picked, if you will, those pieces of information that buttress their case and made unequivocal statement to the American people.

It is very fascinating when the American people and the United States Congress learn that there is a special covert group within the Department of Defense. And this is within the civilian leadership, called the Office for Special Plans that was running a parallel operation in terms of intelligence analysis. It was that group that was doing the cherry-picking. It was that group that got us into this war. They made unequivocal statements, like Secretary Rumsfeld, that those weapons of mass destruction, we know where they are. They are in Tikrit, in the west here and in the east here. And, of course, we have discovered after expending close to a billion dollars to just simply looking for them that they do not exist, much to our embarrassment and again our loss of prestige.

So I think it is important that those who attack the CIA often do it in a way that I think reveals their own political agenda. Again, demeaning the professionalism of the men and women that serve in the CIA is not the way to have a constructive debate about what we ought to occur, what we ought to be doing right now.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would just concur with the gentleman that that is a very interesting Newsweek article. I read it a few hours ago. It is very disturbing because it does lay out how under the Vice President's leadership, this Office of Special Plans collected their own information and drew their own conclusions, and then they use those conclusions to encourage the kind of action that occurred.

Now, the fact is that the President has finally admitted quite publicly, in spite of the Vice President's statement to the contrary, that there is no evidence that Iraq or Saddam Hussein was responsible for the attack upon our Nation on September 11, 2001. That is a very critical conclusion, I think, for us to have come to. Because given that and given the fact that we had weapons inspectors in Iraq and they were asking for more time, would not you think that if there is uncertainty about exactly what Saddam Hussein has or may have, that there is no evidence that he was involved in the direct attack upon our country, that we would have approached this situation a little more cautiously, a little more thoughtfully, that we would have expended the time that the inspectors were asking for.

If we had done that, it may have been possible. It may have been possible.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Again, this is a situation that is continuing today where a conclusion or an opinion or a predisposed policy is searching for facts.

Talking about the CIA, what prompted Paul Bremer to come to Washington, DC, was a new top secret CIA report from Iraq that growing numbers of Iraqis are concluding that the U.S.-led coalition can be defeated and a supporting the insurgents.

Again, I am quoting from a newspaper report, ''The report paints a bleak picture of the political and security situation in Iraq and cautions that the U.S.-led drive to rebuild a country as a democracy could collapse.''

The report's bleak tone and Bremer's private endorsement differ sharply with the upbeat public assessments that President Bush, his chief aids, and even Bremer are giving as part of an aggressive publicity campaign aimed at countering rising anxieties over increasing U.S. causalities in Iraq. Let us be honest with the American people. Remember in Vietnam what, I daresay, forced Lyndon Johnson to reassess his plans for reelection, was the fact that there was such a great divergence and disparity between the reality that was being presented to the American people and the reality on the ground.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, let me introduce our colleague who has been waiting patiently. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for putting this special order together.

I think that it is very clear we now know that they wanted to go to war immediately after 9/11 in Iraq. They went to Afghanistan really because that was more obvious to people at that point, but they were clearly planning for a long time and they simply misled us about what was there.

Everybody understands that now. There is no mystery in this country or anywhere else in the world. The question is, What are we going to do now?

I picked up the Sunday morning newspaper and last Thursday I came back to Washington, DC and went out to MCI Center to a hockey game with a bunch of amputees from Walter Reed. The next day I went up there and walked through several of the wards. There are two pictures of the front page of young men who have been severely injured that I know. I have met them. These are young kids who did what their country asked them, and we honored them.

I told them I was there because I wanted to say thank you. But the fact is that that is exactly what happened in Vietnam. Young people went and died doing exactly what they were asked to do. It is the leadership that ought to have to pay the price and they ought to start paying it right now.

We have a President who simply will not get off the fact that he made a mistake. He simply went the wrong place. He should never have stopped the war on terror. He should have finished what was going on in Afghanistan and then perhaps you look later at something, but Afghanistan is as bad or worse than it was when we went in there.

We still have people dying there. One died yesterday from the State of Washington. And we continued to allow our young people, men and women, now to be killed in a war that makes no sense in the way it is being run. And the President will not admit it. The whole world has told him that. They told him on the 25th of February, ten million people marched in the streets this in this country. The President said, It is just a focus group. We are going to war.

Now, my belief is that we have to figure out how we get out and how we, with honor, get out of this thing. It is going to be very difficult to do that.

□ 2230

When they called Bremer back here in the other day, it was simply because they said, gee, it is 1 year to the election. How in the heck are we going to explain this mess at election time? We have got to end it. So we are now, in every decision that will be made, it will be made not about what is good for our troops or what is good for the Reservists or the Guard people or anybody else, but what is seen to be good for the President's reelection campaign.

I am afraid that unless the Congress raises some noise about this, we are going to see more people sacrificed in this process because they will not get the international community in. If the President would say tomorrow, I want Kofi Annan to take over the reconstruction and Kofi Annan to take over the military peacekeeping in the country, we will make a contribution as we have but we are not going to run it, things would begin to change dramatically.

This is viewed as an occupation. The actual choice of where do they go with their headquarters when they came into Baghdad, they went to the palaces that Saddam Hussein had built and they moved in, and they said to the people, this is where we belong; we are running the place. No Iraqi missed the message.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the good doctor will allow me to interject a thought here, the President tries to set this up as a two choice paradigm. We either do exactly what we are doing now or, as he says, we cut and run, as if there are no other options, but the gentleman is describing a third option. There may be a fourth or a fifth option. We ought to be looking at the situation, not just simply blindly pursuing a course of action that is resulting in more and more death.

Quite frankly, I resent it when the President refers to those of us who question his policies as those who want to cut and run. The last thing I want to do in Iraq is cut and run. We cannot cut and run, and I know not a single Democrat who is suggesting that course of action, but that does not mean that we endorse his plan because his plan is getting us deeper and deeper and deeper into a quagmire. More and more young Americans are being killed, and even more are being seriously wounded. We cannot allow this situation to continue.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The hardest part about this is that the American people are not being told the truth. If we read the American newspapers, they are told there are only 5,000 in al Qaeda over in Iraq. If we read the European papers, they say 50,000. We do not see any bodies coming back. They have absolutely prohibited the press and the media from going out to Dover when the troops come back or to go to cemeteries when people are being buried. They are simply blinding the American people's eyes. In my view, the American people have to demand that they know what is going on, and I think there is really no excuse for what they have done except that they have to make the political campaign look better.

This is a mess. Everywhere in the world we look at the press, any country in the world we see the press. They have all analyzed the President made a big mistake. The French, in fact, were right. If people really want to understand what is going on here, go watch the movie The Battle of Algiers. The French went through exactly the same thing in Algeria. There has not been a country in the 20th century that invaded a sovereign country and came out whole. Everybody loses.

Whether we are talking about Vietnam or we are talking about Algeria or we are talking about Lebanon or we are talking about any of those countries, the people who invaded always back out with their tail between their legs, and that is where we are today. Those kids, we have still got them out on the line; hold on, kid; keep fighting; try and save yourself. The people behind them are making bad decisions, again and again and again. It is a terrifying thing, and I think the American people cannot let them be blinded from it. They have to begin to demand that they see what the truth is.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I believe our hour is up. I thank all of my colleagues for taking part in Iraq Watch tonight, and we will be back next week.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5401. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5402. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to help ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo; (H. Doc. No. 108—142); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

5403. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Report for 2002 on IAEA Activities in Countries Described in Section 307 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, pursuant to Public Law 105—277, section 2809(c)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

5404. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5405. A letter from the Chairman, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting a report submitted in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5406. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting As required by Section 417(b) of the USA Patriot Act of 2001 (as enacted in Public Law 107-56), the second annual report on the status of the implementation of machine-readable passports (MRPs) in countries participating in the Visa Waiver Program (VWP); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a Feasibility Study and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the Port of Los Angeles Channel Deepening Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5408. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Miles 94.0 to 96.0, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-03-003] (RIN: 2115 — AA97) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5409. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Arlington Channel Turning Basin, Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-03-010] (RIN: 1625 — AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5410. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Lower Mississippi River, Above Head of Passes, LA [COTP New Orleans — 03-007] (RIN: 1625 — AA-00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5411. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Port Arthur Ship Canal, Port Arthur, TX [COTP Port Arthur-03-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5412. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red River, Miles 88.0 to 89.0, Pineville, LA [COTP New Orleans-03-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5413. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: Protection of High Capacity Passenger Vessels in Prince William Sound, Alaska [COTP-PWS-03-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5414. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; San Juan, Puerto Rico [COTP San Juan 03-062] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5415. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Miles 85.0 to 91.0, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-03-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5416. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile Marker 446.0 to 454.6, Chattanooga, TN [COTP Paducah, KY 03-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5417. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile Marker 446.0 to 454.6, Chattanooga, TN [COTP Paducah-03-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5418. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.3 to Mile Marker 0.7, Pittsburgh, PA [COTP Pittsburgh-03-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5419. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.3 to Mile Marker 0.7, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. [COTP Pittsburgh-03-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5420. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Harley Owners Group (H.O.G.) Rally, Ohio River Mile Marker 0.7 to Mile Marker 0.3 on the Allegheny River Pittsburgh, PA [COTP Pittsburgh 03-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received November 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 154. A bill to exclude certain properties from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System; with an amendment (Rept. 108–359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 521. A bill to establish the Steel Industry National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with an amendment (Rept. 108–360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1594. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the St. Croix National Heritage Area in St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1618. A bill to establish the Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1648. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution systems of the Cachuma Project, California, to the Carpinteria Valley Water District and the Montecito Water District (Rept. 108–363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Williamson County, Texas, Water Recycling and Reuse Project, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1798. A bill to establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1862. A bill to establish the Oil Region National Heritage Area; with an amendment (Rept. 108–366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2425. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Quinault Indian Nation under United States Claims Court Dockets 772–71, 773–71, 774–71, and 775–71, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2489. A bill to provide for the distribution of judgment funds to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe; with an amendment (Rept. 108–368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. S. 625. An act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies in the Tualatin River Basin in Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 280. A bill to establish the National Aviation Heritage Area, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 421. A bill to reauthorize the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution and for other purposes; (Rept. 108–371 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. S. 1233. An act to authorize assistance for the National Great Blacks in Wax Museum and Justice Learning Center (Rept. 108–372 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1964. A bill to establish the Highlands Stewardship Area in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–373 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. S. 523. An act to make technical corrections to law relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–374, Pt. 1); referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than November 21, 2003, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.