



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2004

No. 16

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 10, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

AMERICAN MIDDLE-CLASS TAX

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, listening to the President's State of the Union speech and the Republican leadership in Congress, I have been struck by the false choices and misplaced priorities that have been presented to the American public.

We heard pledges from the Presidential candidates on the campaign trail in the year 2000 to save the Social Security surplus and put it in a lockbox.

The reality of the President's 2005 budget proposal is that he feels it is

more important to reward those who need help the least, instead of correcting, for example, the looming crisis in Social Security. Perhaps, a cynic would say, because it does not explode until after the expiration of the next Presidential term.

Rather than protect future retirements for American workers, this administration would instead borrow more from the Social Security trust fund to finance tax breaks for people who already have gained the most. But the most disingenuous, insidious, and destructive of all of these policies to American middle-class families is the refusal to deal with the alternative minimum tax, which has become a cruel penalty on middle America.

This tax was established 35 years ago after a study revealed that there were 155 people who paid no Federal income tax at all despite having an annual income, in today's dollars, of over a million dollars. This led to the alternative minimum tax passed in 1969. It was designed to ensure that a few ultra-rich people at least paid something. This alternative minimum tax, the AMT, has now morphed into a money-raising bonanza for the Federal Government and a nightmare for middle America.

Because it was never indexed for inflation, more people pay this every year, people who were never designed to be subjected to it. Congress now uses these tax revenues to finance other tax cuts for more privileged people. The goal of the administration and the Republican Congress is to make dividend and investment income tax free, inheritances tax free.

As recently as 1997, less than 1 percent of the American tax payers were subjected to the alternative minimum tax. Because of inflation, rising incomes, and added gimmicks to the tax system, today, almost 2½ million families pay the AMT. By 2005, we will have five times as many people, over 12 million families; by 2010 over 33 million

American families are going to be providing half the Federal income tax through the alternative minimum tax. By 2013, 10 years from now, 37 percent of all taxpayers, 41 million families, will pay it.

The tragedy is that instead of catching a few who avoid paying taxes, the alternative minimum tax is specifically penalizing hard-working families who are doing exactly what government and this administration ask. Rather than strike people who avoid paying taxes, the alternative minimum tax penalizes families who are because they pay high local property and income taxes. It penalizes people with children who take advantage of the child care deductions and family credits. It penalizes those who save for their own future with 401(k) or other tax-deferred programs. These things trigger the alternative minimum tax for doing exactly what people are asked by this government to do.

Finally, many people are going to pay more to a CPA to make complex calculations than the tax itself will cost them, thus a double tax penalty.

Where is the outrage from this administration and from the Republican leadership in Congress about this disaster that is befalling American families? They claim that they are for tax fairness and justice, yet they are addicted to the Federal Government raising revenues unfairly while they are cutting taxes for people whose taxes have already been cut and who need the help least of any Americans.

Federal taxes overall as a percentage of government spending are at the lowest level of national income since the 1950s; but they are being shifted. Because of the policies of my Republican friends in Congress and this administration, they are being shifted to America's hard-working families who deserve better.

There ought to be no more talk about tax cuts for the most well-off until we

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H397

fix this nightmare. The failure to address the alternative minimum tax makes a mockery of alleged concern for middle America, for families, and for tax fairness.

WE DID THE RIGHT THING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for such time as he may consume.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, there is one point to make in the debate about the war on Iraq and it is this: we did the right thing.

After September 11, President Bush declared war on the terrorists and all the regimes who support them. Saddam Hussein's dictatorship was the very definition of a terrorist regime. He started two wars, invaded two neighbors, and tried to assassinate an American President. He was obsessed with obtaining nuclear weapons and was bent on using them to blackmail the civilized world. He was a merciless tyrant with no respect for human life who butchered his own people and threatened the stability of a fragile region in the Middle East. He worked with terrorists and financed their operations. He was going to kill more Americans and help others to do so. In short, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein was Iraq's weapons of mass destruction; and he had to be removed.

Yet, now in this political season, partisan opportunists suggest that the war was somehow illegitimate because we have not found massive World War II-style warehouses full of missiles. But 9-11 taught us that our enemies need not have conventional weapons to threaten us. If Saddam Hussein had just a briefcase full of one chemical or so much as a vile of another given his past, his hatred of the United States and his ties to international terrorism, he posed a grave and gathering threat to our national security, period.

Critics who now undermine the legitimacy of Operation Iraqi Freedom with their slanderous attacks against the President and the international intelligence community undermined our security at the same time. Revisionists these days seem to believe it was someone other than Saddam Hussein who deceived the international community during the buildup of this war. But by doing so, Mr. Speaker, they embolden our enemies. Every world leader, especially those of us with the honor to serve in this body, should stand up and speak with one voice on the war on terror and how it will be fought and how we should win it in Iraq and elsewhere. Undermining our mission in Iraq to score political points dishonors the victory we won there and the legacy of the men and women who gave their lives in its winning.

We did the right thing, Mr. Speaker; and we would do it again.

PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT FOR OUTSOURCING JOBS IS OUTRAGEOUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I picked up a newspaper, picked up a Los Angeles Times, and the headline of the Los Angeles Times, I believe the second largest daily paper in the Nation, said, "Bush Supports Shift of Jobs Overseas." The subheadline was, "The loss of work to other countries, while painful in the short term, will enrich our economy eventually," the President's report to Congress says.

Now, I thought maybe that was just an overzealous headline writer, so I looked at some other newspapers.

The Seattle Times headline was, "Bush Report: Sending Jobs Overseas Helps the United States."

Then I looked at the Pittsburg Post Gazette: "Bush Economic Report Praises Outsourcing Jobs," sending those jobs overseas. The Orlando Sentinel in the President's brother's home State: "Bush Says Sending Jobs Abroad Can Be Beneficial."

Now, this is a President of the United States who in 3 years has seen a job loss of 3 million people. In my home State of Ohio, we have lost 300,000 jobs. One out of six manufacturing jobs in Ohio has disappeared to Mexico, to China, somewhere overseas generally.

We have seen continued job loss in every State in this country. In fact, we have seen manufacturing job loss every single month of the Bush administration. And after I read these headlines and I read the articles which correspond precisely to the headlines, it makes me think maybe that is the Bush plan overall, that we are sending these jobs overseas. Maybe that is what he planned. And that does not make any sense, that the President of the United States would want to send jobs overseas; but this President supported the North American Free Trade Agreement running for Governor of Texas. Then he supported as Governor of Texas the Permanent Normal Trade Relations, the trade agreement with China. He supported Fast Track Trade Promotion Authority. He now supports the Central American Free Trade Agreement which will hemorrhage more jobs to Latin America. And his office is right now negotiating the Free Trade Act of the Americas, which will quadruple the size of the North American Free Trade Agreement, causing more hemorrhaging of jobs.

So when the President's head of Council of Economic Advisors, Gregory Mankiw, when he prepared this report, he said in this report, "Outsourcing is just a way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were tradeable in the past. And that is a good thing." He then goes on to claim that, as the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who is with me here,

points out, that this Bush plan will create 2.6 million jobs in 2004.

It is another promise of job creation, but we have seen manufacturing job loss every single month of the Bush administration. And now apparently they are saying this outsourcing, this job loss overseas is a good thing.

Now, the most interesting, maybe if not the most important because it is not as big as the job loss in manufacturing, but he talks about one particular group of people who happen to be radiologists. And I know of radiologists in the United States, they are the people that read the x-rays and the MRIs and all of that, who have said that when they take x-rays, when they do MRIs, sometimes those x-rays are literally e-mailed to India, read by radiologists in India, and then sent back. So radiologists are concerned about their work, frankly.

In his report he said, "Maybe we will outsource a few radiologists. What does that mean? Maybe the next generation of doctors will train fewer radiologists and will train more general practitioners or surgeons. Maybe we have learned that we do not have a comparative advantage in radiologists."

Maybe Mr. Mankiw has read too many economics text books when he says we do not have a comparative advantage in radiologists.

But the point, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration has totally lost touch with reality, if they can look in the eye a worker in Akron, Ohio, in the steel industry or in Lorraine or Cleveland or anywhere in this country, look them in the eye and they can say, outsourcing is a good thing. Your job going overseas is a good thing because then maybe you can get a job at Walmart that pays \$7 an hour with health care benefits. Or maybe you can get a job somewhere else part-time, or maybe you can figure out what is going to happen to your health insurance and what is going to happen to your pension.

The fact is that this administration's answer to everything is more tax cuts for the richest people and more trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs overseas. We have seen enough job loss in this country without the President piling on, without the President, as the L.A. Times says, supporting the shift of jobs overseas; without the President, as the Seattle Times said, sending jobs overseas helps the United States; without the President, as the Pittsburg Post Gazette says, his economic report praises outsourcing jobs; or as the Orlando Sentinel says, sending jobs abroad can be beneficial.

It does not make sense for our country. It does not make sense for workers. It does not make sense for our people.

□ 1245

DEFICIT ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to the order of the

House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague from Ohio that President Clinton of his party supported a lot of this free trade. In fact, President Clinton was very active in getting passed in previous Congresses many of these free trade agreements that the gentleman from Ohio is complaining about. So I think it is just a question of whether one is for free trade or not. I am for fair trade not free trade.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about a deficit that is continuing quite dramatically, and now all of us are faced with a tough task of balancing the budget the next 5 years, and the President is committed to that.

One of the reasons this budget is in a deficit mode is because of the recession that President Bush inherited; also what happened on 9/11. It changed this country's perspective completely and, of course, with it our efforts to secure our homeland borders and security within our buildings. So, obviously, we have had to expend extra money to do that; and the President rightly did so and Congress agreed to reduce taxes so we could help the economy.

Obviously, there is no quick fix for the deficit. However, we must act decisively today in the budget process so that we do not put undue burden on future generations.

I believe that Members of Congress realize how accountability works. We want to support reduced spending around here, and that is why I am introducing a bill this day to underscore accountability that will connect all of us here in Congress with the rest of the country.

Year in and year out, we all have to explain to our constituents why we automatically receive a pay raise regardless of the deficit that occurs here in Congress. So why not have a bill simply to say that no automatic pay adjustments will be made for Members of Congress in the year following a fiscal year in which there is a Federal budget deficit? Something very simple. My bill, the Deficit Accountability Act of 2004, basically says that, again, no automatic pay adjustments are made for us here in Congress unless we balance the budget.

If this Congress can work together, I think we can control spending. We must lead by example, and I believe this simple measure could do just that. The bill would provide a real-world incentive for Members of Congress to curtail wasteful and abusive spending.

So it is a good-faith measure, Mr. Speaker. It is in a small way just symbolic, but I think our constituents would appreciate that, and that is why I am offering this bill today.

All of us have returned from our respective retreats, the Democrats and Republicans, and all of us, of course, are resolved to have a tougher stance

on spending and try to balance the budget. There has been some talk again about having a line item veto. I would like to see that effort reenergized, re-enacted; and I believe now is the time to support the shift in this fiscal environment towards a balanced budget.

Momentum is building in this House to write a congressional budget resolution that would freeze outright non-defense, nonhomeland security appropriations. Furthermore, many Members have introduced legislation that seeks to make deep cuts in the discretionary spending of the various departments. These departments have lots of accountability problems. There is waste and fraud in some of these Departments. The President's budget proposal makes a strong effort to address these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I just bring to my colleagues' attention a recent GAO report that showed that the collective departments, across the board every department in the budget reported a staggering \$17.3 billion in unreconciled transactions in 2002. That is, to put it bluntly, we have lost \$17 billion. It is unaccounted for. I know all Members will agree that these lost funds are staggering, and something must be done to get to the bottom of this, and obviously in this budget process we should do this.

At this time, we clearly have an opportunity to curtail wasteful spending and at the same time support our President as he seeks to balance the budget in the next 5 years. I believe starting today this body can make a statement of how we want spending in this Congress to proceed and also how to pay ourselves in the event we have a deficit. Mr. Speaker, we must draw a line on spending, and hopefully we can now remember it is the American taxpayers who occupy the most prominent position at the negotiating table here in Washington.

THE RULE OF LAW SHOULD MATTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, just for a second I would like to go over the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio where he says that the Republican administration actually promotes the outsourcing of jobs, reducing jobs here in the United States. It almost makes it sound like the Bush administration does not care about Americans.

Keep in mind, for every 100 jobs we export, we create one or two very rich Americans; and, on balance, that may be thought to be a good thing by the Bush administration.

We also have a huge half trillion dollar trade deficit.

THEFT OF DOCUMENTS FROM JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

But I want to remind my colleagues of a day back in 1972 when we had a positive trade surplus and when the Watergate headquarters of the Democratic Party was burglarized. Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy went to jail for that burglary because Republicans here in Washington believed that the rule of law was more important than Republican success.

Today, a similar crime has been committed. At the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, a computer server that was jointly used by Democrats and Republicans was burglarized, and thousands of the Democrats' documents were stolen, far more than Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy ever thought to steal.

A shared computer server is not an unusual thing on Capitol Hill. My Democratic colleagues need to be reminded that every e-mail we send, every e-mail we receive goes through a shared computer server, under the control ultimately of the Speaker of this House and his staff. But we Democrats here in the House do not believe that the Speaker and his staff are criminals. We believe they are honorable men and women, and so we send e-mail today just as we do every other day.

What is happening in the other body, Mr. Speaker? A small cabal has decided to burglarize documents. That is the same as what happened back in 1972, but what is more interesting is that the predominant power in the Republican party, the predominant power here in Washington, wants to protect this act of robbery.

Sure, one staffer has been fired. Now that staffer is free to obtain lucrative employment and cash gifts without having to report it. Another staffer has left, and that staffer boasts about being in control of stolen documents, stolen property. Instead of going to jail for being in possession of stolen property, he trumpets how he is going to use this property for the support of the Republican position.

The rule of law should matter. We are told, though, that the rule of law is being upheld because a couple of staffers lost their jobs. Since when is it the criminal law in this country that if one steals something the only sanction is they have to go get employment elsewhere?

We are told that this crime is not a crime because it was a shared computer server. That is a little dangerous for Democrats in the House, where every e-mail is going through a shared server under Republican control.

It is also a complete repudiation of American criminal law. If two partners share a safe deposit box or a safe, that does not mean that one can use the combination to steal all the cash and valuables that the other has put in it. It is very clear. Sharing a box does not mean one gets to steal the other person's or other entity's property. Except that is what it seems to mean in the Republican lexicon.

Burglary and robbery are reasons for people to be indicted and sent to jail. That is what happened to G. Gordon Liddy, that is what happened to Howard Hunt, and we will see whether the Republicans in control of this House and the other body, and in control of Washington and all of its agencies, will make sure that there is a criminal investigation of this theft. Stealing from a safe is wrong, even if one has been trusted with the combination.

If this does not happen, then we in the House will have to look at the additional governmental expense involved in having a separate Democratic e-mail server. Because how can we trust a Republican Party that seems to have gone from a party that puts the rule of law first to one that glorifies burglary and defends criminals?

I look forward to the indictment of those who committed robbery.

19-CENTS-A-DAY CAMPAIGN ON SCHOOL FEEDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the well of this floor many times to speak in support of the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

McGovern-Dole provides hungry children around the world at least one nutritious meal a day in a school setting. The Bush administration's own Department of Agriculture has evaluated this program and found it to be very effective at reducing child hunger, increasing academic attendance and performance, especially among girls, and strengthening community commitment to education.

The McGovern-Dole program is carried out in the field by a wide range of partners, principally through U.S. private voluntary organizations and the United Nations World Food Programme, which has a special unit specializing in school feeding programs.

Currently, the World Food Programme, or WFP, carries out McGovern-Dole-supported school feeding programs in Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Ivory Coast, Ghana, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Tanzania and Uganda. But this is just part of WFP's worldwide effort in the area of school feeding, which reaches literally every corner of the world.

Mr. Speaker, over 840 million people do not have enough food to eat on a daily basis. Three hundred million of these are children, who go to sleep every night without enough food to eat. Today, and every day, 24,000 people will die because of hunger and its ugly effects. This is more than HIV and AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis combined, although hunger and disease are closely intertwined.

In short, between 8 and 10 million people die needlessly every year because of hunger and malnutrition.

Last year, the World Health Organization listed the top 10 health risks around the world. The number one risk is not cancer or HIV/AIDS or heart disease. It is not war or armed conflict or accidents. The number one health risk in the world is simply the lack of food.

In an effort to reach out to students and communities throughout the United States, the World Food Programme has launched a campaign to raise money and awareness about the hunger and educational needs of children in Third World countries.

This campaign will help shine a light on what life is like for the more than 300 million children who daily endure, suffer and die from hunger. Nearly half of these children, mainly girls, do not go to school. The campaign will give students in communities a simple yet concrete way to make a difference in these children's futures.

The campaign is called the 19-Cents-a-Day Campaign depicted in this poster here. Why 19 cents? Because 19 cents is the average daily cost to feed a child in a school setting.

Think about this for a moment, Mr. Speaker. Nineteen cents a day, a dime, a nickel and four pennies, that is half the cost of a first-class stamp. For about the cost of one Big Mac, a soda and an order of fries each month, we can feed a child for an entire school year.

Mr. Speaker, we know that one of the best steps anyone can take to reduce or escape poverty is to get an education. Offering a meal at school is a proven method of convincing poor families to send their children to school, including their daughters.

Last month, Judith Lewis, the Washington Director of WFP, traveled to her home State of Mississippi to officially launch the 19-Cents-a-Day Campaign. Mississippi is a place that knows something about hunger. Last year, over 392,000 Mississippi children received free or reduced school lunches. I am happy to report the response from the high school students in Brandon, Mississippi, was overwhelmingly positive, raising hundreds of dollars for WFP school feeding programs.

The 19-Cents-a-Day Campaign is a great way to talk about child hunger, both around the world and in our own congressional districts. It is a great way to raise awareness and funds and engage our own students and communities in the fight against hunger abroad and here at home.

□ 1300

In the weeks to come, the campaign will be launched in high schools in Illinois, North Carolina, and California. I hope to launch a similar campaign in Massachusetts, my home State. I encourage my colleagues to contact the World Food Program to find out more about the 19 Cents a Day Campaign and how more students and communities can become involved.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe we can end hunger among children, both here in the United States and around the world. It only takes the time, commitment, and political will to do so.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord, did Your ancient seer David see people gathered on Capitol Hill when he asked: "Who shall climb the mountain of the Lord? Who shall stand in the Lord's awesome presence?"

Surely the Members of Congress know the answer to this question as did David's own: "Those with clean hands and pure hearts. Those who do not desire worthless things or have never taken an oath only to deceive their neighbor."

Lord, this great Nation and its fullness, the whole world and all its people are Yours. Renew Your blessings upon us today and make us humble enough to acknowledge that all is Your gift.

So we enter into Your presence to praise You now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MICHAUD 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 9, 2004 at 1:03 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits the Economic Report of the President.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-145)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed:

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

As 2004 begins, America's economy is strong and getting stronger. Over the past several years, this Nation has faced major economic challenges resulting from the decline of the stock market beginning in early 2000, a recession that began shortly after, revelations about corporate governance scandals, slow growth among many of our major trading partners, terrorist attacks, and the war against terror, including in Afghanistan and Iraq. These challenges affected business and consumer confidence and resulted in hardship for people in many industries and regions of our Nation. Americans have responded to each challenge, and now we have the results: renewed confidence, strong growth, new jobs, and a mounting prosperity that will reach every corner of America.

This Report, prepared by my Council of Economic Advisers, describes the economic challenges we faced, the actions we took, and the results we are seeing. It also discusses our plan to continue growing the economy and creating jobs.

In May 2003, I signed a Jobs and Growth bill that focused on three key goals. First, we accelerated previously passed tax relief and let American households keep more of their own money to save, invest, and spend. Second, we increased incentives for small businesses to invest in new equipment and plant expansions. Third, we enacted important tax relief on dividend income and capital gains to help investors and businesses. These actions were designed to promote investment, job creation, and income growth. By all three measures of performance, we are seeing signs of success.

Since May 2003, we have seen the economy grow at its fastest pace in nearly 20 years. Consumers and businesses have gained confidence. Retail sales are strong, and Americans are buying, building, and renovating houses at a record pace. Investment has strengthened, with spending on business equipment the best in 5 years. The unemployment rate has fallen from its peak of 6.3 percent last June to 5.7 percent in December, and employment is beginning to rise as new jobs are created especially in small business. Productivity growth has been strong, leading to higher incomes for workers, while the tax relief we passed means that American families keep more of their money instead of sending it to Washington.

We are moving in the right direction, but have more to do. I will not be satisfied until every American who wants a job can find one. I have outlined a six-point plan to promote job creation and strong economic growth. This plan includes initiatives to help manage rising health care costs to make health care more affordable and accessible for American workers and families; reduce the burden of junk lawsuits on the economy; ensure a reliable and affordable energy supply; simplify and streamline government regulations; open foreign markets for American goods and services; and allow businesses and families to keep more of their hard-earned money and plan with confidence by making our tax relief permanent. This year, I will work with the Congress to achieve these goals.

I will also continue to work with the Congress on another important shared goal: controlling federal spending and reducing the deficit. The federal budget is in deficit, foremost because of the economic slowdown and then recession that began in 2000 and the additional costs of fighting the war on terror and protecting the homeland. We are continuing to take action to restrain spending and bring the deficit down. By carefully evaluating priorities and being good stewards of the taxpayer's money, we will cut the budget deficit in half over the next five years.

The task of reducing the deficit will become easier because America's economy is growing. We have taken the actions needed to restore growth, and we are pursuing additional policies to help create jobs for American workers and families. I'm optimistic about the future of our economy because I know the values of America and the decency and entrepreneurial spirit of our people.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2004.

PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, the proliferation of weapons of mass de-

struction poses the most serious of dangers to the peace of the world. Chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists could bring catastrophic harm to America and to our friends around the world. We must oppose that threat by any means necessary.

The men and women of our intelligence community have already found a very revealing component of Iraq's biological weapons program. Two mobile production facilities equipped to produce biological weapons. Iraqis allege that these trucks are pharmaceutical labs. But what possible reason could there be for two such mobile labs in the middle of the desert? And why, if these vehicles were merely pharmaceutical trucks, did the Iraqi soldiers wash them out with bleach while the war was going on?

President Bush's decisive action and leadership is keeping our country and allies safe from terrorist groups that are unrestrained in their choice of weapon and undeterred by conventional means. Our perseverance and our belief in the success of liberty assures our security, and we will not relent until this war is won.

OUTSOURCING OF U.S. SERVICE JOBS OVERSEAS

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in total disbelief. The Washington Post reported this morning that President Bush's top economic adviser, Gregory Mankiw, said that outsourcing U.S. service jobs overseas is actually good for the Nation's economy. This is absolutely outrageous. Sending jobs overseas is good?

Just tell that to the 23,000 Mainers who lost their manufacturing jobs in the last 8 years. Tell that to the 2.2 million Americans who lost their jobs since President Bush took office. These people have seen their hard-earned jobs shipped overseas due to unfair trade agreements and terrible management of our economy. They are the ones who suffer.

I spent 30 years working in a paper mill. It went bankrupt last year. Maybe this administration should take a look at what is happening in places like my hometown, places that need these jobs all across America, before saying that shipping jobs overseas is a good idea.

It might give them a dose of reality that real Americans face every day.

COMMENDING FN MANUFACTURING, INC.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when Americans watch the nightly news images of U.S. troops on

duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, they see them carrying out their most difficult duties, using the finest small arms in the world. Those weapons are proudly made in South Carolina's Second Congressional District by FNMI, FN Manufacturing, Incorporated, in Columbia, South Carolina.

Since the mid-1980s, FNMI has been building the M-16 rifle, the M-249 Squad Automatic Weapon, and the M-240 Medium Machine Gun for the U.S. Armed Forces. In other words, FNMI is the principal supplier of small arms to the military. These arms are universally recognized as the finest infantry weapons in the world, perhaps the finest ever made. They are known for their ruggedness, reliability, and effectiveness and are on duty everywhere American troops are deployed in the war on terror, as I have seen first hand in Iraq.

Additionally, FNMI is one of the largest defense industries in South Carolina, employing approximately 450 dedicated personnel.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking the professional employees of FNMI Manufacturing, as their work makes it possible for our brave men and women to protect us in the war on terrorism.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

REMEMBERING CARLIE BRUCIA

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a saddened heart that I come to speak to this Chamber today. Last week our Nation was again rocked when we learned of another senseless death of an innocent child. Carlie Brucia, a beautiful young girl from Sarasota, Florida, was violently kidnapped and brutally murdered on her way home from a friend's house, not too far away from her own.

There is nothing I can say that will bring comfort to her family today. No parent should ever lose a child, and all communities throughout the country should shiver at what has happened in Florida this past week. This crime happened in daylight, on a major thoroughfare and in front of passersby. Carlie's death is not just her family's loss but a loss to us all.

This fallen angel's death must not be in vain. Police and prosecutors must ensure that her murderer will never see the light of day again, but that is not enough. We must come together as a community, and as a State, to make sure we never let such a crime happen in our backyard again.

The AMBER Alert system is the best tool we have, but it is just a tool. I wish there was something I could do to undo this terrible crime, but I cannot. What I can offer is my promise to Carlie's family that I will never stop working to ensure that law enforce-

ment has the tools necessary to capture these pedophiles and that families are fully armed with the information they need to protect themselves and their children.

Mr. Speaker, all I can wish for is that I will never have to come to the House floor to talk about the murder of another child ever again. I want to offer my deepest condolences to Carlie's family. I hope that with the help of their family and friends they will be able to get through this terrible time. God bless Carlie.

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.

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

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL"

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 358) authorizing the printing of "History of the United States Capitol" as a House document.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 358

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF PRINTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be printed as a House document the book entitled "History of the United States Capitol" by Glenn Brown, as prepared under the auspices of the Architect of the Capitol with support from the United States Capitol Preservation Commission and the United States Capitol Historical Society.

(b) SPECIFICATIONS.—The document described in subsection (a) shall include illustrations and shall be in the style, form, manner, and binding as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing after consultation with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.

SEC. 2. NUMBER OF COPIES.

In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed for the use of the House of Representatives and Senate the lesser of—

(1) 7,000 copies of the document described in section 1(a), to be allocated as determined jointly by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate; or

(2) such maximum number of copies of the document as does not have a total production and printing cost of more than \$182,000, with distribution to be allocated as described in paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

□ 1415

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 358. This is somewhat of a mundane measure. As a member of the Committee on House Administration, it is a housekeeping responsibility that we take care of obligations such as this.

This particular measure authorizes the printing of a new annotated edition of the United States Capitol by Glenn Brown. Brown's History of the United States Capitol represents the most scholarly publication on the United States Capitol to date. This book was originally written to celebrate the centennial of the move of Congress to the Capitol in 1800.

The volume by Brown continues to provide important information on the development of the United States Capitol building and is also a visual record of the building and the art collection at the turn of the century. The publication sets a new standard for architectural history, as well as being very well received in both this country and abroad.

Glenn Brown's book also played an important role in the revival of Pierre Charles L'Enfant's plan for Washington, D.C., through its influence on the 1901 McMillan Plan; and thus it has also had a very significant effect on the shape of this city, the District of Columbia, and how we see it through the twentieth century.

The idea of publishing a new annotated edition of Glenn Brown's history of the Capitol, published in 1900 and 1903, was first discussed back in 1987. This new annotated history will provide both historical context and contemporary perspective. Glenn Brown and his philosophy and achievements will be examined in the introductory biographical profile.

Annotation of the text will correct errors, review some very important, sometimes controversial issues, mention recently discovered documentation and direct the reader to relevant sources. The publication will be illustrated with high-quality photographs based on Glenn Brown's selection and will introduce color when appropriate to enhance the architectural renderings.

The book will be prepared under the auspices of the Architect of the Capitol, with support from the United States Capitol Preservation Commission and the United States Capitol Historical Society.

Glenn Brown's History of the United States Capitol will be of interest not only to Members of Congress but of significant value to the public, to libraries across the United States, and also to scholars investigating the rich history of the United States Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I urge full support of House Concurrent Resolution 358. I am pleased to present it on behalf of the Committee on House Administration this afternoon.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

As a sponsor of this resolution, I join our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and I am happy to help bring this publication to fruition. It has been a pleasure for me to work with the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) on this and other such collaborative matters as they regard the history of our great institution and the history of this Capitol.

The gentleman from Ohio will recall that we worked together in developing a history of the House, and his long-standing appreciation of the history of this great institution of ours and history in general go a long way towards keeping those relationships that accrue on our committee and throughout this institution at a level of deep understanding about the process and the procedure that goes on in this glorious building on a regular basis.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has outlined the importance of Glenn Brown's landmark two-volume History of the United States Capitol. Clearly, history should be updated from time to time, especially with the kind of annotated pictures that we can now provide for people, which yet unfolds the richness of this great institution and this marvelous building.

People that come to work here on a daily basis and those that visit the Capitol cannot help but be in awe of the marble and the alabaster of Statuary Hall and all the great symbolism and history represented here. So for us not to make sure that these publications continue to go forward and further enlighten and provide historical research and data about our institution would be a travesty.

Therefore, I am delighted to join with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and again want to applaud the outstanding leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) and his willingness to collaborate on this specific publication, an interest that is both near and dear to both of our hearts with regard to historic preservation.

For more than two centuries, this Capitol has stood as a shrine to our democracy and a beacon to millions across the globe. We must preserve not only the bricks and mortar of this Capitol but also its history. The volume printed pursuant to this resolution will make a substantial contribution to that preservation. I urge an "aye" vote on this motion.

As the sponsor of the resolution, I join the distinguished chairman in support of his motion, and I am happy to help bring this publication to fruition. It has been a pleasure to work with the chairman in the past 5 years on matters of common interest, especially related to congressional history. The gentleman may re-

call that shortly after he became the chairman of the House Administration Committee, I visited his Longworth office and discussed placing a greater emphasis on the history of this institution. We have had significant success in this respect, as the gentleman had while serving in his state's legislature in Columbus. I look forward to working with the chairman further on history-related matters in the months and years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the American people revere this historic Capitol, the temple of our democracy, and they are rightly proud of what it has come to represent. In the more than 227 years since our Founding Fathers charted a new course for our civilization, this experiment in self-government has not only survived, but flourished. The ideals symbolized by this Capitol inspire millions around the world, giving hope that they and their descendants may someday enjoy the liberty that Americans cherish.

Over a century ago, Congress celebrated the Capitols' centennial by publishing Glenn Brown's landmark two-volume History of the United States Capitol. Brown's handsome volumes chronicled the development of the Capitol and its art collection to that time. Brown's work set a new standard for architectural history, affecting the development of the Capitol, and of the capital city, in the years that followed.

The Capitol has changed considerably in the last century, and present generation should take care to document those changes and preserve the history of this magnificent structure for the future. Plans for an updated, annotated edition of the Glenn Brown History began as the Capitol's 2000 bicentennial approach, and Congress authorized such a volume in 1993. Today, only the final proof-reading work remains, save for this renewed printing resolution, before the Government Printing Office can proceed to publish.

The new annotated volume will update the Glenn Brown work, correcting errors, adding new historical context and enhanced color photographs, among other improvements. The new edition, prepared by the Architect of the Capitol with the support of the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission and the U.S. Capital Historical Society, will be published under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing in consulting with the House Clerk and the Senate Secretary. The joint committee plans a single-volume format that is both economical and reader-friendly but, like the original, worthy of this splendid structure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the motion. This body should ensure preservation of the Capitol's history, just as in 1999, with the gentleman from Ohio's strong support, the House passed my bill authorizing a written history of the House itself. That House history, being written by the distinguished historian Dr. Robert Remini, is well underway. As entertaining as he is learned, Professor Remini participated last November in the Cannon Centenary Conference on the modern speakership. Those fortunate to hear the professor's remarks left both enlightened and eager to read the completed work chronicling the House's role and contributions to America's history.

Mr. Speaker, for more than two centuries this Capitol has stood as a shrine to our democracy and a beacon to millions across the globe. We must preserve not only the bricks and mortar of this Capitol, but also its history.

The volume printed pursuant to this resolution will make a substantial contribution to that preservation, and I urge an "aye" vote on the motion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, I am very pleased that we can come together and take care of this housekeeping chore. During the discussion this afternoon on the passage of this resolution I would have liked to have been presented a copy of Mr. Brown's book. I am told the only volumes we have the Architect has, and they are too tattered to even leave his office. So it is time that Congress meet its obligation of preserving the rich history of this great building that is a symbol of liberty and democracy.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time and ask for passage of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 358.

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. MICA. 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. MICA. 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. Con. Res. 358.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY AS PART OF COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 359) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 359

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on April 22, 2004, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of

victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 359, which permits the Capitol Rotunda to be used for a ceremony as part of the Days of Remembrance commemorating the victims of the Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to go through this procedure to use the very sacred center of the Capitol for a ceremony and joint authorization by both the House and the other body because of the significance of this particular location and its significance and importance in this building.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum is mandated by Congress to educate Americans about the history of the Holocaust and to annually honor and remember the victims of this catastrophic, horrible event, and that is done on the National Days of Remembrance observance. The purpose of the Days of Remembrance is to ask all Americans to reflect on the Holocaust, to remember the victims and to renew and strengthen our commitment to democracy and to human rights for every person.

The very first Days of Remembrance ceremony was held in the United States Capitol Rotunda in the year 1979. It has been held there every year since, except when the Rotunda has been closed for renovations. At last year's National Days of Remembrance observance, Secretary of State Colin Powell gave the keynote address. The theme of this year's Days of Remembrance commemoration is entitled "Justice and Humanity." That title, Justice and Humanity, is in memory of the Jews of Hungary who were deported 60 years ago in the final stages of World War II. The commemoration will honor the courageous individuals, as well as the organizations and countries who attempted to rescue them.

In this country, official response to the mass murder of European Jews and others resulted in the creation of the War Refugee Board in 1944. Established by the Executive Order of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the War Refugee Board worked with Jewish organizations, diplomats from neutral countries and resistance groups in Europe to rescue Jews from occupied territories and provide relief to inmates of Nazi concentration camps. Although belated, this action saved thousands of lives, reminding us of the terrible consequences of indifference and of the ability of organizations, individuals and countries to confront and work to halt acts of genocide or related crimes against humanity.

How appropriate I believe it is, Mr. Speaker, at this time that we remember the victims of the World War II Holocaust. It is my hope also that during this ceremony we can reflect upon others who have lost their life to genocide and to murderous regimes. I have often wondered how the world could stand by in World War II and not do more to save people who were headed for extermination camps. Not being alive in that era, I have, however, been alive during an era of other holocausts, such as in Cambodia, where millions literally were murdered in a genocide.

□ 1430

During my term in office, I remember Rwanda where nearly a million Africans were slaughtered and the world did not come to their aid. And, once again, we remember and we should reflect during our Day of Remembrance on those in Iraq as we uncover hundreds of mass graves throughout that country. Our obligation, whether it is in Asia, Africa or the Middle East, is to make certain that a holocaust does not take place, to make certain that tens of thousands are not murdered by any despot regime.

This ceremony that will be conducted will be the centerpiece of similar remembrance observances to be held throughout our Nation in all 50 States. Members of Congress, government officials, foreign dignitaries, Holocaust survivors and citizens from all walks of life have attended previous commemorations. House Concurrent Resolution 359 provides for the 2004 commemoration to be held in the rotunda on the day of April 22 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of my colleagues for this resolution.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of humility and strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 359, authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda for the Days of Remembrance ceremony on April 22.

During the week of April 18, similar Holocaust remembrance days will take place all across this country, as the distinguished gentleman from Florida pointed out. As this body has done every year since 1979, Congress will use the historic rotunda location to reflect on one of the most painful moments in all of world history: the Holocaust.

This very special day of remembrance, along with the creation of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, was established by Congress to permanently honor these victims. They were created not only to remember those who perished but also to educate the world about human rights.

The 2004 Days of Remembrance asks us to honor the memory of the Jews of

Hungary, who were deported 60 years ago in the final stages of World War II, and to honor those courageous individuals as well as the few organizations and countries who attempted to rescue them. This year's theme is "For Justice and Humanity." It has specific poignancy for me as a Member from Connecticut, knowing that Hadassah Lieberman's mother was part of that.

I had the honor in Connecticut as Senate President to preside over the Days of Remembrances for 8 years. I often reflect on how solemn and important those ceremonies were, and still are. I can still see the survivors and their family members coming forward to light the candles and the solemnness of the occasion.

Given the current conflicts around the world, it is especially important to remember the message of the Holocaust victims who said, do not forget us. We cannot forget them or the evil that sent them to their deaths. Tragically, we need only to watch the nightly news to realize that this evil still exists in the world.

The ceremony we are authorizing today reminds us that when we respect the lessons of the past, we strengthen the values of every future generation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), my friend, for yielding me this time; and I also want to thank him and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for managing this concurrent resolution. I also, Mr. Speaker, want to thank the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), for permitting me to carry this piece of legislation.

I have had the pleasure for the last 10 years to be a member of the Holocaust Governing Council, one of the five appointed Members of Congress. During my time in Congress I have seen such giants in this institution as Ben Gilman of New York and recently the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) in bringing this resolution to the floor, and it is an honor for me to have the opportunity to be a part of that today.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 359 permits the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to use the Capitol rotunda for the Days of Remembrance observance. This annual event, which takes place in the symbolic heart of our American democracy, honors the victims of the Holocaust and is a reminder to all of us that freedom and liberty have both rights and responsibilities.

Since the opening of the museum and the beginning of the Days of Remembrance sponsored by the museum,

world events have continued to demonstrate that it is imperative that we remember and study the Holocaust. From the violent breakup of Yugoslavia and the cataclysmic terror in Rwanda, to the rise of anti-semitism around the world that continues today, we live in a time when the great strides in human rights made over the last half century are in danger of losing ground to ignorance and intolerance.

That is why the theme of this year's commemoration, "For Justice and Humanity," is so timely. The title comes from a statement made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt who, when he called for the rescue of the Jewish population in Hungary in March of 1944, said, "In the name of justice and humanity, let all freedom-loving people rally to this righteous undertaking." By honoring rescuers along with the victims in this year's commemoration, we are shining a light on the brave acts of individuals and organizations that can teach important lessons today.

Of course, we know that it was too late for many Jews in Hungary in 1944. With the war entering its final stages, Nazi and Hungarian authorities deported about 440,000 Jews. At least half of those were murdered in gas chambers immediately upon their arrival at the labor camp Auschwitz. By the time the Nazis and their Hungarian collaborators were driven out of Hungary in April, 1945, nearly four-fifths of the Hungarian Jewish community had been killed.

Yet there were some individuals, organizations and countries that asserted the value of human life in the face of the systematic murder of men, women and children. The War Refugee Board, established in January of 1944 by President Roosevelt, had the mandate to take "all measures to rescue victims of oppression in imminent danger of death."

Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat based in Hungary, led the War Refugee Board's most extensive rescue efforts by distributing protective Swedish passports or travel papers to tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews. Carl Lutz, a Swiss diplomat, issued certificates of emigration, placing nearly 50,000 Jews in Budapest under Swiss protection. Italian businessman Giorgio Perlasca issued forged visas and established safe houses. When Budapest was liberated in February of 1945, more than 100,000 Jews still remained in the city because of the efforts of Wallenberg, Lutz, Perlasca and other diplomats and individuals. The War Refugee Board played a crucial role in the rescue of as many as 200,000 Jews in German-occupied Europe.

This year, as we commemorate the lives of the millions of victims of the Holocaust, we also pay tribute to the rescuers for their courageous efforts rallying "to this righteous undertaking."

The first visit that I had to the Holocaust Museum following my election in 1994, I was taken around by the son of

a Holocaust survivor; and there are two exhibits that I would commend to my colleagues on their next visit. One was a temporary exhibit that detailed the sailing of the steamship *St. Louis* and how that boat was turned from port to port to port as no one would take the Jews into their country.

The second is the failed conference that took place in Avignon, France, where countries from around the world, aware of the "Jewish problem" during the Second World War and some of the solutions that Nazi Germany was prepared to undertake, country after country declined to take affirmative action to take Jewish immigrants into its borders, the United States being one of them.

As we ponder not only the Days of Remembrance, I hope that we as legislators also learn the lessons of the *St. Louis* and the conference at Avignon; and I would ask all of my colleagues to join us in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 359.

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

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

Again, I would like to close on this particular resolution before the House, a simple resolution to allow the use of the rotunda for this ceremony. But when we enter the rotunda, the sacred center of the Capitol building on April 22, it is important that we do remember those victims who were lost in this horrific slaughter of human beings in World War II. We remember, as the gentleman from Ohio said so eloquently, that there were incidents like the turning away of the steamship *St. Louis* that went from port to port, and hundreds met a horrible fate because of the nations, and even the United States, who turned their backs.

The good Lord gave the United States the responsibility now, as the superpower of the world, an important responsibility that we should not lose sight of.

So as we reflect upon those victims, as we reflect upon those who ignored their responsibility, and as we recognize our responsibility in the world today, it is important that again we reflect at this time on what occurred, what was done, and what was left undone, and that we also make certain as we reflect on April 22 that we do not allow a holocaust of our time.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 359, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol to commemorate the Days of Remembrance of victims of the holocaust.

It is appropriate that we commemorate those who perished during the Holocaust. It is also important that we not forget that genocide and human rights abuses continue to occur elsewhere around the world. As the leader of the Free World, the United States must use its

power and influence to bring stability to the world. History serves as a lesson to all, and we must ensure that the horrors of the Holocaust must never happen again.

I am proud to be a founding trustee of the Virginia Holocaust Museum and am pleased that a growing number of community-based Holocaust museums around the county are a reflection of our increasing awareness of the lessons of the Holocaust. Only when every person understands the magnitude of death, destruction, and utter horrors of the Holocaust can we feel we have done everything to prevent its recurrence.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of H. Con. Res. 359, to allow the use of the Capitol Rotunda for a ceremony to commemorate victims of the Holocaust. Our Nation's Capitol is a symbol of freedom and democracy to so many. This resolution gives us a forum to pay service to the victims of the Holocaust. I pray that such a tragedy should never touch the world again.

A Holocaust memorial is not something to be taken lightly, or to be rushed without its due respect. The Holocaust is a product of authoritarian government and evil intentions, and we must continue to study and remember it, lest it be repeated. Hate, genocide, racial supremacism still occur in parts of the world and I believe that we as Americans can still focus our efforts on stopping them before they grow to an uncontrollable magnitude.

My heart goes out to the victims and survivors of Adolf Hitler's death camps. Every time I reexamine the Holocaust, and pay tribute to what happened, I am still shocked and pained by the organized, methodical killing that went on in Europe.

For the 12 million people that Nazi Germany exterminated, we must remember. For each of the six million Jews killed, we must respond. For the Gypsies, the gays, the political dissenters and any of the righteous people who spoke out against what they thought was evil—for this we commemorate and remember the Holocaust. It can never happen again.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 359.

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. MICA. 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. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H. Con. Res. 359.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO DR. DOROTHY HEIGHT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 357) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Dorothy Height.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 357

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on March 24, 2004, for a ceremony to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Dorothy Height. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this afternoon in support of House Concurrent Resolution 357. This is a resolution authorizing again the use of the rotunda for a ceremony which will be conducted on March 24 honoring Dr. Dorothy Height. Dorothy Height will receive a great honor of the United States Congress when she is awarded in that ceremony the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. Speaker, as we just authorized the use of the rotunda for a different ceremony, and that particular ceremony and the previous action for a memorial service, this is a service of celebration and also of the life of a distinguished American, Dr. Dorothy Height.

□ 1445

This is a service of celebration and also of the life of the distinguished American, Dr. Dorothy Height. On December 6, 2003, the resolution awarding Dr. Dorothy Height the Congressional Gold medal became public law. That is the purpose for our requesting a ceremony in the Capitol rotunda; and, of course, as I said before, we need permission of the House and the other body to conduct this ceremony.

I want to talk a little bit about Dorothy Height and tell a little bit about her history. She is an outstanding American and truly deserving of this great honor.

Dorothy Height was born in Richmond, Virginia, in 1912. At an early age she moved with her family to Rankin, Pennsylvania. While in high school, Dorothy Height was awarded a scholar-

ship to New York University where she studied and earned a master's degree. At a very early age she established herself as a dedicated student with exceptional oratorical skills.

After graduating from New York University, Dr. Height began her career working as a case worker with the New York City Welfare Department. At the age of 25, she began her journey as a civil rights activist when she joined the National Council of Negro Women. In 1957, Dr. Height was named president of the council, a position which she held until 1977.

During the height of the civil rights movement in the late 1960s, Dorothy organized Weekdays in Mississippi, which brought together black and white women from the North and the South to create a dialogue of mutual understanding.

Throughout her life, Dr. Height fought for equal rights for both African Americans and also for women. And in 1944 she joined the national staff of the Young Women's Christian Association, the YWCA. She remained active with the organization until 1977. During her tenure at the YWCA, she developed leadership training and other programs and other projects promoting racial and religious tolerance and understanding.

Dr. Height has served our Nation in a number of different capacities during her distinguished career, including as a consultant on African Affairs to the Secretary of State, also as a member of both the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and on the President's Committee on the Status of Women. Her tireless efforts for equal rights have earned her the praise and recognition of numerous organizations as well. She has received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Freedom From Want Award, and the NAACP Springarn Medal and now the Congressional Gold Medal. Dr. Height has also been inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame.

Dr. Height's work has helped countless women in America and around the world participate in democratic reform resulting in new opportunities for themselves, for their families, and their communities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if you ever had a chance to hear or see Dorothy Height, you had an opportunity to see one of the most distinguished advocates for women, an advocate for minorities that has ever been in our country's history.

If you have not seen Dr. Dorothy Height, you missed the glow in her eyes, you missed the sparkle in her voice, you missed the strength of an individual who has gone beyond so many barriers in her life, again, opening doors and offering opportunities to women, to minorities, and to all Americans.

I am a strong admirer of this lady and what she has done. I know a former Member of the House, Connie Morella,

often talked about Dr. Height and her accomplishments; and others will come forward when we pass this resolution to honor her accomplishments. So I am absolutely delighted this afternoon to be here to offer this resolution to authorize the use of the Capitol rotunda where we will present this distinguished medal to a great American, Dr. Dorothy Height.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who is eloquent and noteworthy in his praise. This has been a historic afternoon in so many respects, pausing to honor the works of Glenn Brown in the historic writings as they relate to this great Capitol facility, pausing to reflect and remember and reserve the great rotunda to participate in the Days of Remembrance with regard to the Holocaust, and now to step forward and pay homage and honor a living legend.

I urge all Members to join all of us in supporting the distinguished chairman's motion. There can be no more appropriate use of the Capitol rotunda than for a ceremony to honor Dr. Dorothy Irene Height for a lifetime of achievement of social equality and justice.

The author of the original legislation, our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), could not be here today, but deserves credit for having had the persistency to make sure that not only would Dr. Height receive the gold medal, but also that we would, as this Congress is required, reserve the rotunda for this great ceremony.

It is important for me today to note that Dr. Height is in my home State of Connecticut at a book signing as I speak. I am pleased that the appropriate ceremony will be approaching next month.

Congress reserves its highest civilian honor for men and women whose contributions to American society exemplify the highest traditions and ideals of public service. By every measure, Dr. Dorothy Height's lifelong commitment to the principles of freedom, equality, and social justice compels this award.

Beginning during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and continuing to the present day, Dorothy Height has fought to promote human and civil rights throughout our society. For decades she has worked tirelessly to promote the appointment of qualified women to senior Federal positions. As president of the National Council of Negro Women since 1957, Dr. Height has been an especially forceful advocate for the advancement of African Americans. In addition, and on a personal note, I would like to acknowledge the work of Mrs. Mary A. Ballard, who

leads the Hartford section of the National Council of Negro Women in my home district.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress recognized last year, there is no doubt that America is a far better place thanks to the labor and commitment of Dr. Dorothy Height on behalf of not only those among us who face the burdens of injustice but all of us. She deserves great credit. The use of the Capitol rotunda to award the gold medal to Dorothy Height is not only fitting; it is required and long overdue.

I urges all Members to join in supporting the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for introducing this resolution, and I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Dr. Dorothy Height is a steadfast pioneer of women's rights and racial justice for people of color. She has set an example of what can be achieved through commitment and group activism.

As the fourth elected president of the National Council of Negro Women, Dr. Height led a crusade for justice for black women. To help strengthen the black family, she conceived of and organized the Black Family Reunion Celebration, which has been held here in Washington since 1986, an activity in which I have participated.

Under the leadership of Dr. Height, the NCNW achieved tax exempt status; raised funds on behalf of thousands of women in support of erecting a statue of Mary McLeod Bethune, NCNW's founder, in a Federal park; she developed several model programs to combat teenage pregnancy and address hunger in rural areas; and established the Bethune Museum and Archives for Black Women, the first institution devoted to black women's history. She was instrumental in the initiation of NCNW-sponsored food, child care, housing and career educational programs.

No stranger to political activism, in the 1960s Dr. Height called on the NCNW to sponsor Wednesdays in Mississippi when interracial groups of women would help out at Freedom Schools and conduct voter registration drives in the North and voter registration in the South. She worked with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Roy Wilkins to prevent lynchings, desegregate the Armed Forces, reform the criminal justice system, and provide equal access to public accommodations.

Dr. Dorothy Irene Height has a long legacy as a leader in the struggle for equality and human rights. She has through her words and deeds proven distinguished service to humanity and her many contributions for equality, social justice and human rights for all people. She is commended for her efforts. And even at this stage of her life, every time I go to an event, an activity, she is generally there in her wheel

chair. Someone is pushing her, bringing her, but she is there.

I grew up as a great fan of Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune. And Dr. Height inherited the legacy. I also work with two women who are very close to Dr. Height, Ms. Rosie Bean and Ms. Arnetta Wilson. I am sure that they are both rejoicing to note that their distinguished leader who is deserving of such an honor is to be recognized.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again support this resolution that I think is somewhat overdue to present and conduct this ceremony for the presentation of the gold medal for Dr. Dorothy Height.

Dr. Dorothy Height, as I said, is a delightful lady. She just celebrated, I am told, her 91st birthday just some 2 weeks ago. She has an incredible career that has spanned nearly this century, and she has a public career that spans over 65 years. She unquestionably has been recognized as one of the pre-eminent social and civil rights activist of our time. In fact, Dorothy Height, I am told, was the only female at the table when Dr. Martin Luther King planned the civil rights movement.

□ 1500

She has all her life struggled for equality, for social justice and for human rights for all people.

Mr. Speaker, when young people need role models, and certainly in the time that we live in they need role models, we have had two women so honored. Soon Dorothy Height will receive this honor. The other I remember is Rosa Parks since I have been in Congress. She was awarded a gold medal, and certainly Dorothy Height is in the same category and deserving of recognition of this honor by Congress.

So I think, whether it is Rosa Parks who changed the course of history in this country or someone who worked tirelessly through their life and has an incredibly distinguished career, as we heard, promoting the rights of all individuals, women and minorities in our society, that we take this time to honor her in this ceremony in March. I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor one of America's great citizens—Dr. Dorothy Height.

For more than six decades, Dorothy Height has tirelessly fought for those who are less fortunate, for those who have been denied access to an education, and for those who have been denied equal rights. Both through personal example and her commitment to social equality, Dorothy Height has provided women and minorities with hope to dream and the tools to realize their potential.

During the civil rights movement, Dorothy Height led the fight for inter-racial schooling, and spearheaded African American voter registration drives. She worked closely with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, A. Philip Randolph, and others as they

developed plans for obtaining civil rights. It should be noted that she was the only woman allowed to be present in several high-powered strategy sessions with those great leaders.

Dorothy Height was an advocate for women's rights during a time when few African American women were engaged in the feminist movement. She fought tirelessly to implement her vision of full and equal employment, fair pay, and access to education for all women.

In addition to her work for equality in the United States, Dr. Dorothy Height has been a leader in the struggle for international human rights. In 1975 she helped establish the sole African-American private voluntary organization working in Africa. She has improved the quality of life for women in developing countries, and has worked to combat the AIDS crisis in Africa.

A Congressional Medal of Honor is well deserved, and one of many honors earned by Dr. Dorothy Height over her long and distinguished career. I am very pleased to join my colleagues in the House in marking this honor for an individual who dedicated her life to the struggle for social equality and justice.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride that I stand before this chamber as we act on legislation that moves us one step closer to awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Dorothy Height.

Two months have passed since the bill bestowing this great honor upon Ms. Height (H.R. 1821) was signed into public law. Now, during the celebration of Black History, I can think of no better time to put the proper procedures in place for Dr. Height to receive her award on March 24, 2004. I can also think of no better place to bestow this award on Dr. Height than in the Capitol rotunda's Statuary Hall—a place that memorializes the giants of our country. I think Dr. Height is a giant in her own right and apparently many people in our country agree.

Who would have imagined some 90 years ago that the daughter of James Edward Height and Fannie (Borroughs) Height of Richmond, Virginia would one day be receiving the Nation's highest civilian honor.

Born in 1912 in Richmond, Virginia, Dr. Dorothy Irene Height distinguished herself at an early age as a dedicated student with exceptional oratorical skills. As a young girl she fearlessly and vehemently stood up to the racist and sexist climate of the times. At the age of 25 she heeded the call of her mentor, Mary McLeod Bethune, founder of the National Council of Negro Women, and joined the struggle for women's full and equal employment and educational advancement. She has and continues to dedicate her life to the struggle for equality, social justice, and human rights for all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, throughout her illustrious career as a civil rights advocate, Dr. Height tirelessly worked to prevent lynching, encourage voter registration, desegregate the armed forces, reform the criminal justice system, and create equal access to public accommodations.

And a long career it has been. In fact, her public career spans 65 years. She was a valued advisor to First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt and encouraged Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson to desegregate the Nation's public schools and to appoint African American women to sub-Cabinet positions. Since 1957,

she has served as President of the National Council of Negro Women, an umbrella organization for 250 local groups and 38 national organizations dedicated to economic development and women's issues.

Mr. Speaker, the numerous awards and accolades Dr. Height has received over the years is a testimony to her invaluable contributions to the progress of this Nation. The NAACP has awarded her The Spingarn Award, its highest honor. She is also the proud recipient of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Award from the National Council of Jewish Women; the Ministerial Interfaith Association Award; the Lovejoy Award; and the Congressional Black Caucus's William L. Dawson Award for her decades of public service to people of color and particularly women. However, Dr. Height is not one to rest on her laurels. She continues to lead the fight against social injustice and inequality. Her profound love for our youth is unmatched. As a direct link to the civil rights movement of the 1960s, Dr. Height continues to inspire future generations of civil rights activists.

What is truly remarkable about this grand dame is that at age 90 she does not plan on slowing down. And although she spends much of her time in a wheelchair, she continues to stand up for equality and social justice.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I am proud to stand before this body as we move ever closer to bestowing upon Dr. Dorothy Height our Nation's highest civilian honor.

I want to thank my colleagues from the House Administration Committee, Mr. LARSON and Mr. NEY for setting the procedural stage to allow this great ceremony to take place in the Capitol rotunda. I especially thank my friend, Diane Watson for sponsoring this legislation as well as for sponsoring the original legislation honoring Dr. Height that passed in the House.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 357, authorizing the use of the capital rotunda to award the congressional gold medal to Dr. Dorothy Height, is offered today to sanction the venue for the upcoming award of the medal to Dr. Height on March 24, 2004.

I want to thank Congressman NEY, Chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and Congressman LARSON, Ranking Member, for their cooperation and support in bringing this bill to the floor in an expeditious manner. I also want to thank Maria Robinson and Catherine Tran, House Administration Committee staff members, for their work.

Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 2003, President Bush signed into law P.L. 108-162, which authorizes Congress to present a congressional gold medal to Dr. Height in recognition of her many distinguished contributions to the nation. The presentation of the congressional medal to Dr. Height will appropriately recognize her long and productive public career and her superior service to our Nation.

Dr. Height's numerous accomplishments span the history of the 20th Century. She is currently President of the National Council of Negro Women (NCNW), a position to which she was appointed in 1957 upon the retirement of Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, one of the most influential African-American women in U.S. history. Under Dr. Height's leadership, the National Council of Negro Women implemented a number of new and innovative programs, including leadership training for African-American women in the rural South; the

Bethune Museum and Archives, devoted to African-American women's history; the Black Family Reunion, a nationwide annual gathering to celebrate not only the black family, but all families; and Operation Woman Power, a project to expand business ownership by women and to provide funds for vocational training.

In addition to her many accomplishments as president of the NCNW, Dr. Height had a persistent, active, and significant presence during our Nation's historic civil rights movement. As a member of the so-called "big six" civil rights leaders, which included A. Philip Randolph, Martin Luther King, and Roy Wilkins, Dr. Height was the only female who participated in the major planning of one of the most important movements in U.S. history. She has been an advisor to presidents, and remains an active and respected advocate for human rights around the globe.

Dr. Height is the recipient of numerous awards over her long and active life, including the Citizens Medal Award, presented by President Reagan, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, awarded by President Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 357 so that Congress can appropriately honor a woman who has done and given so much to better our Nation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor to rise before this body as a strong supporter of the H. Con. Res. 357.

I first want to thank my distinguished colleague, Ms. WATSON for her diligent work on this resolution. And I also wish her a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of people like Dorothy Height that we can all enjoy the freedom that America bestows upon her people. Ms. Height is a pioneer and trail-blazer. Like other pioneers, both celebrated and unknown, she has opened the doors of opportunity to all, making America the free country it is today.

From the very beginning, Dorothy Height was a crusader. During the depths of the Great Depression she managed to do something very few of her contemporaries were able to accomplish.

She knew that education was a key to making one's way in the world and the way to enlighten the path for others. She graduated from New York University with a bachelors and a master's degree in Education in 1933.

Immediately afterward, she launched a career in civil rights. She has remained on the battlefield for six decades. Her first venue for advocating the rights of others was the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA). Here she led an advocacy movement aimed at improving conditions for black domestic workers.

Within the YWCA, she worked to integrate an organization that still had separate facilities for blacks and whites. Because of her determined and dogged efforts, women of all racial backgrounds could use the same facilities with the same privileges.

Her leadership at the national level resulted in the YWCA adopting an interracial charter in 1946 that called on the organization and its members to stand against racial injustice in the United States.

After her work with the YWCA, Ms. Height became president of the National Council of Negro Women. She steered the organization through the civil rights struggle of the 1960's.

She helped organize voter registration in the South, at a time when it was dangerous and

nearly impossible to be an African-American voter below the Mason-Dixon line.

Ms. Height also organized voter education programs and scholarship programs for student civil rights workers.

In 1970 Dorothy Height expanded the goals of the NCNW to encompass vocational training and assist women in opening businesses, forms of education that were not readily available to women at the time.

Since then, Dorothy Height has served as a social services expert on local, state, and federal governmental committees concerned with women's issues. She has also led numerous campaigns for the war on drugs, encouraging youngsters to take advantage of education and vocational training.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996, the United States Government recognized Dorothy Height's achievements with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join my friend, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. WATSON, in support of this most appropriate use of the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this legislation that honors and salutes a giant and to acknowledge my good friend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for her leadership and insight on an effort long overdue.

We have all truly been blessed with Dr. Dorothy Irene Height, born on March 24, 1912 in Richmond, Virginia and raised in Rankin, Pennsylvania. Many of us have had the fortunate opportunity to study Dr. Height's personal and professional history and her numerous contributions—which are extensive, as she has given the greater part of her life to the service of others. Therefore, some might describe her as an activist for social justice and civil rights, a servant of the people, one who has served a number of Presidents, a humanitarian, an American hero, and a patriot, to name a few. The above-mentioned titles are merely words but are given color and meaning when one actually meets the acquaintance of Dr. Dorothy Height. Her charm, energy, insight, intellect, wisdom, and her compassion easily captivate others. I am honored to have had the opportunity, among others, to share in her vision. It is wonderful to know that she can speak eloquently about Mary McLeod Bethune, that she can speak to the concept of ownership for African American people, having led the effort to erect the first African American-owned building on Pennsylvania Avenue just two blocks away from the White House. She believes in women's rights and the economic empowerment of minorities and is a strong, passionate activist for these causes.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here today because our words are simply that, simple words, mere words. But if our presence on the floor today commemorates the honor that is being given to Dr. Dorothy Height under the leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), I urge my colleagues to join us in acting to honor and salute this great leader. Dr. Height, we love you.

Dorothy Height's lifetime of achievement measures the liberation of Black America, the advance of women's rights, and a determined effort to lift the poor and the powerless into the Halls of Power and influence in our Nation. She began her career as a staff member of

the YWCA in New York City, becoming director of the Center for Racial Justice. She became a volunteer with the National Council of Negro Women (NCNW), where she worked with its founder, Mary McLeod Bethune.

When Bethune died, Height became president, a position she continues to hold. NCNW, an organization of national organizations and community sections with outreach to four million women, develops model national and international community-based programs, sent scores of women to help in the Freedom Schools of the civil rights movement, and spearheaded voter registration drives. Height's collaborative leadership style brings together people of different cultures for mutual benefit.

Because of Dorothy Height's commitment to the "Black family," she has hosted the Black Family Reunion Celebration since 1986, in which almost 10 million have participated. As stated above, Dr. Height was born in Richmond, Virginia, and moved with her parents to Ranklin, Pennsylvania at an early age. Winner of a scholarship for her exceptional oratorical skills, she entered New York University where she earned the Bachelor and Master degrees in 4 years.

While working as a caseworker for the welfare department in New York, Dr. Height joined the NCNW in 1937 and her career as a pioneer in civil rights activities began to unfold. She served on the national staff of the YWCA of USA from 1944 to 1977 where she was active in developing its leadership training and interracial and ecumenical education programs. In 1965 she inaugurated the Center for Racial Justice which is still a major initiative of the National YWCA. She served as the 10th national president of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., from 1946 to 1957 before becoming president of the NCNW in 1958.

Working closely with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, A. Philip Randolph and others, Dr. Height participated in virtually all major civil and human rights events in the 1950's and 1960's. For her tireless efforts on behalf of the less fortunate, President Ronald Reagan presented her the Citizens Medal Award for distinguished service to the country in 1989.

Dr. Height is known for her extensive international and developmental education work. She initiated the sole African American private voluntary organization working in Africa in 1975, building on the success of NCNW's assignments in Asia, Africa, Europe, and South America.

In three decades of national leadership, she has served on major policy-making bodies affecting women, social welfare, economic development, and civil and human rights, and has received numerous appointments and awards. As president of NCNW, Dorothy Irene Height has an outstanding record of accomplishments. As a self-help advocate, she has been instrumental in the initiation of NCNW sponsored food, child care, housing and career educational programs that embody the principles of self-reliance. As a promotor of Black family life she conceived and organized the Black Family Reunion Celebration in 1986 to reinforce the historic strengths and traditional values of the African American Family. Now in its ninth year, this multi-city cultural event has attracted some 11.5 million people.

Dr. Height's lifetime of achievement measures the liberation of Black America, the brilliant advance of women's rights, and the most

determined effort to lift up the poor and the powerless. Still fighting, pushing, and advocating, Dr. Dorothy Height—mother, wife, grandmother, great-grandmother, doctor, civil/human rights activist, and freedom fighter continues unrelentingly to serve our country in the health and most meaningfully—the civil arena at the age of 91.

Dr. Height is a commendable and formidable woman. She has wholeheartedly devoted her life to public service, struggling for social justice, the eradication and education of HIV/AIDS, unprivileged children, equal rights, voting rights, women's rights, and education opportunities for all citizens irrespective of color, ethnicity, gender, disability, sexuality and other markers of difference.

She as the leading lady in the civil rights movement, sitting as the only female on the planning table with Whitney Young, Dr. Martin Luther King, James Farmer, A. Phillip Randolph, and Roy Wilkins. She has been and continues to be emulated internationally. Needless to say, Dr. Height is a jewel in the African American community and an influential and exemplary leader in the country.

Many examples of her work stand out in our minds. To give just one—under her leadership of the National Negro Women's Council, she introduced and implemented many initiatives and programs geared towards the betterment of the Afro-American community, the advancement of minority women in all sectors of society, most notably, in business and non-traditional careers. Serving in all capacities imaginable, she has served distinguishably.

Dream giver and earth shaker, Dr. Dorothy Height has followed and expanded on the original purpose of the National Council of Negro Women, giving new meaning, new courage and pride to women, youth and families everywhere. While most individuals resolve to retirement at her current age, Dr. Dorothy Height continues to extend and commit herself beyond measures; she has done so not for recognition or national esteem, but as a labor of love. For the above-mentioned reasons, it is our rightful duty to honor her in recognition of her many priceless contributions to the civil growth of this nation and the beautiful legacy she will leave by awarding her a congressional gold medal.

For the above reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 357.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 357.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. 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. 357.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION COMMEMORATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 264) authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 264

Whereas Constantino Brumidi, born in Rome, Italy, on July 26, 1805, landed at New York Harbor on September 18, 1852, as a political exile, making his flight from Italy to the United States because of his love for liberty;

Whereas Constantino Brumidi's love for his adopted country led him to seek citizenship 2 years after his arrival;

Whereas in 1855, Constantino Brumidi began his artistic work in the Capitol, and spent more than 25 years of his life painting, decorating, and beautifying the corridors, committee rooms, and Rotunda of the Capitol;

Whereas Constantino Brumidi created many magnificent paintings and decorations, depicting the history, inventions, values, and ideals of the United States, thus enhancing the dignity and beauty of the Capitol and inspiring millions of visitors;

Whereas in 1865, Constantino Brumidi painted, in just 11 months, his masterpiece "The Apotheosis of Washington" in the canopy of the eye of the Capitol dome;

Whereas in 1871, Constantino Brumidi created the first tribute to an African-American in the Capitol when he placed the figure of Crispus Attucks at the center of his painting of the Boston Massacre;

Whereas in 1877, at the age of 72, Constantino Brumidi began his last work, the fresco frieze encircling the top of the Rotunda, and 3 years later fell from a slipped scaffolding and was never able to return to work;

Whereas Constantino Brumidi died as a result of this experience 3 months later in February 1880;

Whereas Constantino Brumidi has been called "the Michelangelo of the Capitol" by historians; and

Whereas the year 2005 marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, as well as the 150th anniversary of the beginning of his artistic career in the Capitol and the 125th anniversary of his death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi and calling upon the people of the United States, State and local governments, and interested organizations to commemorate this anniversary with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

I am pleased to offer a resolution, the fourth measure today. This bill passed

the Committee on Government Reform and will be considered by the full House at this time, a resolution which would honor the memory of Constantino Brumidi.

Not too many people have probably heard of Constantino Brumidi. He is not exactly a household word or name in America, but Constantino Brumidi has been called the Michelangelo of the United States Capitol Building. House Concurrent Resolution 264 was introduced to honor both the life and also the work and creative genius of Constantino Brumidi.

Mr. Brumidi was an Italian immigrant who spent 25 years, from 1855 to 1880, painting, decorating and making the United States Capitol as we know it even today a more beautiful place to live and visit and have as a treasure for our country.

Brumidi was born in Italy in 1805, and he worked as an artist in Rome. He also worked in the Vatican, where he had many commissions, including a famous portrait of Pope Pius IX.

In 1852, Brumidi immigrated to the United States; and he dedicated really the balance of his life to making this building, our United States Capitol, one of the most impressive structures in our great Nation.

In 1865, Brumidi spent 11 months walking dangerously and working high atop the Capitol rotunda where he labored on his masterpiece. His masterpiece, and we can see it today if we walk out into the rotunda and look up, is called *The Apotheosis of Washington*, and it is located in the very center, in the eye of the dome of the ceiling of the Capitol.

Six years later, he created the first tribute to an African American in the Capitol when he placed the figure of *Crispus Attucks* at the center of his painting of the *Boston Massacre*.

In 1878, at the age of 72 and in poor health, Brumidi began work on the rotunda frieze. If we look in the Capitol around the frieze, about midway, we can see his work. The frieze chronicles the history of the United States.

Constantino Brumidi's life and work exemplifies the lives of millions of immigrants who came to the United States, and they came from all lands, sometimes to escape adverse conditions, to build a better life, to leave the problems of their native lands, and they brought their skills and their hard work and their talents, which not only bettered their lives and those of their children but immensely created the art, the trade, the richness that we have in the United States and enjoy today.

There are many organizations supporting this resolution, including NAIF, which is the National American Italian Foundation. That is an organization that promotes Italian American relations, cultural and business relations. We also have other numerous United States Italian American groups who support the recognition that we are bringing forward today, again to

recognize the life and talents of Constantino Brumidi.

The year 2005 is the bicentennial of Brumidi's work, and I can think of no better way to honor this patriotic Italian American's contribution to our great Nation, to this incredibly historic building, than by passing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution.

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

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

Let me, first of all, commend the gentleman for his introduction of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 264 honors the 200th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi. Mr. Brumidi was a wonderful artist who dedicated over 25 years to painting the Capitol Building. He is a symbol of the American dream. Born in Italy, he moved to the United States and, like so many other immigrants, made wonderful contributions to our great country.

Although Mr. Brumidi was known for his masterpiece, *The Apotheosis of Washington*, located in the Capitol dome, I would like to mention the fact that he was first to use the Capitol to pay tribute to an African American when he painted *Crispus Attucks* in his portrayal of the *Boston Massacre*.

Another treasure is Brumidi's corridors, the beautifully decorated corridors on the first floor of the Senate wing in the Capitol.

Mr. Brumidi's work is enjoyed by the millions of visitors to the Capitol each year, as well as by those of us who have the privilege of using the Capitol for official business.

Mr. Speaker, an outstanding artist, whose work continues to delight and inspire millions of people each and every year as they come and visit the Capitol, as they view portraits of the Capitol and as they recognize the tremendous masterpiece that this edifice is, and so I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), for introducing this resolution.

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

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

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 264, a resolution again recognizing the 200th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi. I urge its adoption.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the proclamation to commemorate the 200th anniversary of Constantino Brumidi's birth. Often referred to as the Michelangelo of the Capitol, Constantino Brumidi's frescoes decorate the Capitol Rotunda, House Chamber, committee rooms, and corridors of the Capitol with their incorporation of classical artistic traditions and patriotic American themes.

Born in Italy in 1805, Constantino Brumidi studied at the Italian Academy of Arts and

demonstrated his talent for fresco painting at a young age, painting several Roman palaces and working three years in the Vatican. He immigrated to America in 1852 at the age of forty-seven and settled in New York City. The artist later took on other important works such as the frescoes in St. Stephen's Church and an allegorical depiction of the Holy Trinity in a Mexico City cathedral. It was upon his return from Mexico that Constantino Brumidi stopped in Washington and visited the Capitol where he was excited about the opportunity to decorate its interiors.

Constantino Brumidi was hired by Captain Montgomery Meigs and his first art work in the Capitol was in the House Committee on Agriculture's room. Because his art garnered such favorable attention, he was awarded more commissions and eventually became a Government painter. While Brumidi created scores of frescoes depicting allegories and scenes from American history, perhaps his most important work was "*The Apotheosis of George Washington*" which appears in the Rotunda of the Capitol dome and depicts Washington's ascension to heaven. Today, no visit to the Capitol is complete without viewing this incredible work. Although immigrating to America later in life, he drew from his Italian artistic experience and blended it with the history of his new country. The artist took great pride in his new home, even signing one fresco, "C. Brumidi Artist Citizen of the U.S."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my district's more than 62,000 constituents of Italian descent, I am proud to join this body in celebrating Constantino Brumidi's lasting contributions to our country as the 200th anniversary of his birth approaches.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 264, I am very pleased to join in this effort to honor the life and accomplishments of Constantino Brumidi. An Italian immigrant of partial Greek descent, his beautiful works of art grace our greatest symbol of democracy, our Capitol building where we gather to conduct the nation's business and where we welcome hundreds of thousands of visitors from around the world each year.

Constantino Brumidi spent 25 years of his life, from 1855 to 1880, painting, decorating and enhancing the beauty of the United States Capitol. This talented artist was born in Rome, Italy to Stauros Brumidi from Greece and Anna Bianchini Brumidi of Rome on July 26, 1805. He was trained as an artist and painted in Rome and at the Vatican. He arrived in New York City as a political refugee on September 18, 1852 and became an American citizen in 1857. He began painting in the U.S. Capitol on February 19, 1855 and spent more than 25 years of his life painting, decorating and beautifying the corridors, committee rooms and the Rotunda of the Capitol. Brumidi created many magnificent paintings and decorations depicting the history, inventions, values and ideals of the United States, thus enhancing the dignity and beauty of the Capitol and inspiring tens of millions of visitors. In 1865, he painted in just 11 months his masterpiece, *The Apotheosis of Washington* in the canopy of the eye of the Capitol dome. In 1871, Brumidi created the first tribute to an African American in the Capitol when he placed the figure of *Crispus Attucks* at the center of his painting of the *Boston Massacre*. He died on February 19, 1880, exactly 25 years to the day that he first began work in the Capitol.

Brumidi also painted in Catholic churches in cities along the east coast, including Washington, DC (St. Aloysius Church), Baltimore, Md., Philadelphia Pa. and most especially, in St. Stephen's Catholic Church in New York City. Brumidi is buried in Glenwood Cemetery in Washington, DC. His grave marker there was authorized and paid for by the U.S. Congress in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Constantino Brumidi Society, and its Chair, Joseph N. Grano, for all of their hard work in promoting a deeper appreciation of the works of this great artist. The Constantino Brumidi Society was organized in February 2000 by individuals with a special interest in the U.S. Capitol and Italian culture for the purpose of educating the public about the life and work of Constantino Brumidi.

The lofty goal of the Constantino Brumidi Society is to make Americans more familiar with his works of art in the Capitol and elsewhere, and to encourage an appreciation for the fine art traditions of the Italian High Renaissance and Baroque which Brumidi studied and employed. They also aim to support and encourage the preservation and conservation of Brumidi's paintings and frescoes in the Capitol and elsewhere, particularly at Our Lady of the Scapular and St. Stephen's Catholic Church in New York City.

In forming this organization, it was also their hope that by celebrating Constantino Brumidi's life and art, this Italian immigrant and American citizen who did so much to beautify the most important building in his adopted country would become a household name, and that every American would come to know this wonderful story. His life story should be seen as emblematic of all the millions of immigrants who came to the United States to better themselves and in consequence enormously enriched their new homeland. In the moving words of Brumidi himself, "I have no longer any desire for fame or fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty."

The Society has as its special focus the year 2005, which will be the bicentennial of Constantino Brumidi's birth, the 150th anniversary of his commencing work in the Capitol and the 125th anniversary of his death.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to honor a man who has secured a special place in our history and in our hearts, both as an extraordinary artist and an outstanding patriot.

Mr. MICA. 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 Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 264.

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. MICA. 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. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of H. Con. Res. 264, the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 743, SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-417) on the resolution (H. Res. 520) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 743) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards for Social Security and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries with representative payees, to enhance program protections, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 358, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 359, by the yeas and nays; and

House Concurrent Resolution 264, by the yeas and nays.

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

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of sus-

pending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 358.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 358, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—402

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

McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering

Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Sullivan
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton

NAYS—1

Ose

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews
Ballenger
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Cardin
Clay
DeGette
DeMint
Doggett
Doyle

Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Gephardt
Hinojosa
Honda
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)

□ 1854

Ms. WOOLSEY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 19, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY AS PART OF COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 359.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 359, 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 402, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becker
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn

Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood

Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
 McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood

Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Townes
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—30

Andrews
Ballenger
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Cardin
Clay
Cooper
Cox
DeGette
DeMint

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1901

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.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 20, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION COMMEMORATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 264.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 264, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Chabot	Gibbons
Ackerman	Chocola	Gilchrest
Aderholt	Clyburn	Gillmor
Akin	Coble	Gingrey
Alexander	Cole	Gonzalez
Allen	Collins	Goode
Baca	Conyers	Goodlatte
Bachus	Cooper	Gordon
Baird	Costello	Goss
Baker	Cox	Granger
Baldwin	Cramer	Graves
Ballance	Crane	Green (TX)
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Green (WI)
Bartlett (MD)	Crowley	Greenwood
Barton (TX)	Cubin	Grijalva
Bass	Culberson	Gutierrez
Beauprez	Cummings	Gutknecht
Becerra	Cunningham	Hall
Bell	Davis (AL)	Harman
Bereuter	Davis (CA)	Harris
Berkley	Davis (FL)	Hart
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Berry	Davis (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Biggart	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes
Bilirakis	Davis, Tom	Hayworth
Bishop (GA)	Deal (GA)	Hefley
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Delahunt	Herger
Blackburn	DeLauro	Hill
Blumenauer	DeLay	Hinchey
Blunt	Deutsch	Hinojosa
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoefel
Bonilla	Dicks	Hoekstra
Bonner	Dingell	Holden
Bono	Dooley (CA)	Holt
Boozman	Doolittle	Hooley (OR)
Boswell	Dreier	Hostettler
Boucher	Duncan	Houghton
Bradley (NH)	Dunn	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	Emanuel	Hunter
Brown (SC)	Engel	Hyde
Brown, Corrine	English	Inslee
Brown-Waite,	Eshoo	Isakson
Ginny	Etheridge	Israel
Burgess	Evans	Issa
Burns	Everett	Istook
Burr	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Feeney	Jackson-Lee
Buyer	Ferguson	(TX)
Calvert	Filner	Jefferson
Camp	Flake	Jenkins
Cannon	Foley	John
Cantor	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Capito	Ford	Johnson (IL)
Capps	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Johnson, Sam
Cardoza	Franks (AZ)	Jones (NC)
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Jones (OH)
Carson (OK)	Frost	Kanjorski
Carter	Gallegly	Kaptur
Case	Garrett (NJ)	Keller
Castle	Gerlach	Kelly

Kennedy (MN)	Myrick	Schrock
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Scott (GA)
Kildee	Napolitano	Scott (VA)
Kilpatrick	Neal (MA)	Sensenbrenner
Kind	Nethercutt	Serrano
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Sessions
Kingston	Ney	Shadegg
Kirk	Northup	Shaw
Kleczka	Norwood	Shays
Kline	Nunes	Sherman
Knollenberg	Nussle	Sherwood
Kolbe	Oberstar	Shimkus
LaHood	Obey	Shuster
Lampson	Olver	Simmons
Langevin	Osborne	Simpson
Lantos	Ose	Skelton
Larsen (WA)	Otter	Smith (MI)
Larson (CT)	Owens	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Oxley	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Leach	Pascrell	Snyder
Lee	Pastor	Solis
Levin	Paul	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Payne	Spratt
Lewis (GA)	Pearce	Stearns
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Stenholm
Linder	Pence	Strickland
Lipinski	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
LoBiondo	Peterson (PA)	Sullivan
Lofgren	Petri	Sweeney
Lowe	Pickering	Tancredo
Lucas (KY)	Pitts	Tanner
Lucas (OK)	Platts	Tauscher
Lynch	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Majette	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
Maloney	Porter	Terry
Manzullo	Portman	Thomas
Markey	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Marshall	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Matheson	Putnam	Thornberry
Matsui	Quinn	Tiahrt
McCarthy (MO)	Ramstad	Tiberi
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Tierney
McCollum	Regula	Toomey
McCotter	Rehberg	Towns
McCrery	Renzi	Turner (OH)
McDermott	Reyes	Turner (TX)
McGovern	Reynolds	Udall (CO)
McHugh	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
McInnis	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Van Hollen
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Velázquez
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
Meenan	Ros-Lehtinen	Vitter
Meek (FL)	Ross	Walden (OR)
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Walsh
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Mica	Royce	Watt
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Waxman
Millender-	Rush	Weiner
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Weller
Miller (MI)	Ryun (KS)	Wexler
Miller (NC)	Sabo	Whitfield
Miller, Gary	Sánchez, Linda	Wicker
Miller, George	T.	Wilson (NM)
Moore	Sánchez, Loretta	Wilson (SC)
Moran (KS)	Sanders	Wolf
Moran (VA)	Sandlin	Woolsey
Murphy	Saxton	Wu
Murtha	Schakowsky	Wynn
Musgrave	Schiff	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews	Edwards	Rahall
Ballenger	Emerson	Slaughter
Boyd	Fattah	Stark
Brady (PA)	Gephardt	Tauzin
Cardin	Honda	Wamp
Clay	King (IA)	Watson
DeGette	Kucinich	Weldon (PA)
DeMint	Mollohan	Young (FL)
Doggett	Ortiz	
Doyle	Radanovich	

□ 1918

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. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes 19, 20, and 21. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of those votes.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). 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.

A CALL FOR INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious to people across the country that this House of Representatives is failing in its responsibility with regard to its oversight of the executive branch. I am referring here, of course, specifically to the assertions that have been made by various people in the administration, Secretary of Defense, the Vice President, others, even the President himself, with regard to the necessity to go to war in Iraq.

This Congress was told and the American people were told that we needed to go to war in Iraq because of the association that existed between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda and also because the regime of Saddam Hussein possessed so-called weapons of mass destruction. Time and time again people in the administration raised the specter of the mushroom cloud to create the impression that the government of Iraq was in the process of creating nuclear weapons that could be used either directly or indirectly against the United States and therefore that the government of Saddam Hussein constituted a direct and immediate threat to the people of our country.

Here, for example, are some of the words of President Bush himself. On September 12 of 2002 he said: "The history, the logic, and the facts lead to one conclusion. Saddam Hussein's regime is a grave and gathering danger. To assume this regime's good faith is to bet the lives of millions and the peace of the world in a reckless gamble, and this is a risk we must not take."

We know that he was wrong, and we have every reason to suspect that he knew he was wrong when he said that. But what has happened, more than 500 American lives have been lost, more than 530 to be exact. Tens of thousands of Americans have been wounded and taken out of Iraq as a result of those wounds. Hundreds of thousands of others have been killed and wounded all on the basis of what now increasingly seems clear to be fraudulent information presented to this Congress and to the American people.

This House of Representatives has a responsibility. It has a responsibility to ensure that the executive branch is acting within the confines of the Constitution. It has a responsibility to make sure that the laws of this country are being obeyed, and it has a responsibility to make sure that the administration is not acting in ways that put American citizens in danger unnecessarily.

It is increasingly clear that the war in Iraq was not a war of necessity but rather it was a war of choice, and that choice was made by high-ranking people in the Bush administration.

So what is our obligation? Our obligation is clear. This Congress should at this moment be preparing to conduct a comprehensive and complete investigation into the allegations made by members of the administration. Supposedly those allegations were based upon intelligence that was supplied to the administration from the Central Intelligence Agency and other intelligence agencies within the Federal Government. But evidence that we have now suggests that the intelligence supplied to the administration was manipulated by people within the administration, perhaps even falsified, in order to justify our war in Iraq.

If that is the case, and it increasingly seems obvious that it is, this Congress has a responsibility to engage in an investigation to get at the truth. To what extent have our intelligence agencies been compromised by this administration? To what extent are our intelligence agencies now less reliable than they were before? And if they have been compromised, as it seems they have, and if they are less reliable, as it seems they are, as a result of the administration's activities, then this Congress has a responsibility to engage in that investigation.

The President just recently has said that he is going to establish a commission to look at some of the intelligence; but we know already, based upon the language coming out of the administration, some of the names of the people who have been suggested as members of that commission, and the limited direction and responsibility of the commission, we know that that commission is not going to conduct the kind of investigation that needs to be conducted if the American people can have some sense of security in the sanity and proper conduct of their intelligence agencies and the way that that information is used by the administration. This Congress needs to begin that investigation, and it needs to begin it immediately.

TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss the reauthorization of highway funding, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

Our transportation system in this country has a direct and significant impact on the daily lives of all Americans. While the United States has benefited greatly from having a strong transportation network, we are indeed approaching a crossroads.

My area, north Texas, has experienced an increase in traffic over the past 3 decades, and this is a result of unprecedented population and employment growth and the underinvestment of Federal funds in my area. In many ways this is a silent crisis, rarely recognized by residents until they find themselves in an unbearable commute to work or unable to make the necessary connections between home, work, and the countless other activities our daily lives demand.

In Texas, our identified transportation needs outstrip available funding three to one. Texas has several specific transportation needs: supporting the international trade transportation, more efficient environmental processes, and expanding innovative financing techniques. Congress and the administration continue to discuss the need for increased funding in the transportation reauthorization bill. But we need to ensure the current Federal transportation dollars are being spent wisely. Our charge as congressional representatives is to protect dollars taken from the taxpayer by streamlining and improving the activities of our Federal Government. There are many important Federal programs such as our transportation programs that are being hurt and neglected with expenditures that could be handled with greater care.

As a member of the committee, I wanted to be certain that the Department of Transportation was ensuring the most efficient business practices within the agency. Last year, just a few months after being sworn in, I met with the Department of Transportation Inspector General, Kenneth Mead, to discuss the business practices of the agency and how Congress can better facilitate the decrease of inappropriate expenditures related to transportation spending. Inspector General Mead and I discussed the need for greater stewardship and oversight of all of the functions of the Department of Transportation.

To date, the Department has not changed the way the agency distributes transportation funding to State and local entities since President Eisenhower was in office. The Inspector General recommended that if 1 percent of the \$500 billion spent over the last 10 years on transportation, if that 1 percent was saved, that would generate an additional \$5 billion; and, in fact, this \$5 billion could equate to the amount of funding needed for four of the 11 major transportation projects going on in this country right now. I believe this practice could better assist the Department of Transportation in spending of taxpayers' dollars more wisely.

There are several successful transportation projects that can be used as

examples for government efficiency. For example, Highway 15 in Utah was rehabilitated ahead of schedule and under budget. In north Texas, the Dallas Area Rapid Transit system worked within their budget last year and actually returned over \$20 million in transit funding to the government. Sadly, there are bad examples of transportation projects that are over budget and behind schedule. The Springfield interchange in Virginia and the Central Artery Project in Boston come to mind. We need to address the misuse of Federal transportation expenditures as soon as possible.

Furthermore, the General Accounting Office has estimated that from fiscal years 1998 to 2001 the highway trust fund lost over \$6 billion because of the ethanol tax exemption. And using the Department of Treasury's projections of the tax receipts based on current law, it is estimated that the highway account will not collect \$13 billion because of the tax exemption from fiscal years 2002 to 2012 and almost \$7 billion from the General Fund transfer between the same years.

Prior to the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, the highway trust fund earned interest on its balance. If the highway trust fund had continued to earn interest on its balance, the Department of Treasury estimates that the highway trust fund would have earned about \$4 billion from 1999 to 2002.

Between modifying the Department's practices with State and local governments and reevaluating the true purposes of the highway trust fund, we can work together to ensure our government is more effective and more efficient for the taxpayer.

I believe we need to have policies included in the TEA-21 reauthorization bill to allow States flexibility to complete large projects in less time and save money. I believe streamlining the design-build process will achieve this goal, and I have asked for its inclusion in the final reauthorization legislation. More funding and modifications of current transportation programs will equate to better roads, bridges and transit facilities, ultimately less congestion, and ultimately a safer environment for our constituents.

I remain committed to working with Federal, State, and local officials during the reauthorization this year to address the long-term needs while ensuring that our Federal Government wisely spends the taxpayers' dollars on infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, finally, it is important to me because constituents in my district spend so much time in traffic jams, and my goal is to make certain that they have just as much time at the dinner table for family discussions as they spend waiting patiently in traffic.

□ 1930

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTS
SHIFT OF JOBS OVERSEAS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, even though I come from Ohio, I picked up the Los Angeles Times today and just could not believe the headline. It said, "President Bush Supports Shift of Jobs Overseas." "The loss of work to other countries," this is the sub-headline, "while painful in the short-term, will enrich the economy eventually, the President's report to Congress says."

I thought, that cannot be it. It is some overzealous headline writer that really did not understand this.

Well, then I started looking at some other papers. I saw the Seattle Times writes, "Bush report: Sending Jobs Overseas Helps U.S."

Then I looked at the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, just down the road a couple hours from where I live in Lorain, Ohio. The headline was, "Bush Economic Report Praises Outsourcing Jobs."

Then the Orlando Sentinel in the home State of the President's brother, Governor Bush, the headline was, "Bush Says Sending Jobs Abroad Can Be Beneficial."

Now, this is pretty hard to understand. The President of the United States, his top economic adviser would issue a report saying it is a great thing we are sending jobs overseas. I began to read about this, and it says, "The movement of American factory jobs and white-collar work to other countries," according to the Bush administration, "is part of a positive transformation that will enrich the U.S. economy over time, even if it causes short-term pain and dislocation."

Gregory Mankiw, the chief economic adviser for the President, the chief economic adviser for the United States of America, said, "Outsourcing is just a new way of doing international trade. That is a good thing."

Now, I want Mr. Mankiw, I want him to look in the eyes of a steelworker in Lorain, Ohio, and look in the eyes of a computer programmer in Palo Alto, California, and look in the eyes of a telephone operator in Akron, Ohio, or look in the eyes of a radiologist and say that outsourcing is a good thing.

But Mr. Mankiw has something today about radiologists, too. Do you remember when we passed other trade agreements in this Congress, past trade agreements, I always said if you get enough education, then you are all set. You just get ahead. You go to school, you get an education, you got a job. That is the way it works.

Well, Mr. Mankiw, the chief economic adviser for the President of the United States, said, "Maybe we will outsource a few radiologists. What does

that mean? Well, maybe the next generation of doctors will train fewer radiologists and will train more general practitioners and more surgeons. Maybe we've learned we don't have a comparative advantage in radiologists."

Obviously, Mr. Mankiw has been reading economic textbooks. He has not been talking to the computer programmer in Palo Alto, he is not talking to the steelworker in Lorain, he is not talking to the telephone operator in Akron, and he is not talking to any radiologists.

Now, why would President Bush's economic adviser say that outsourcing is a good idea? These are the same people that support the North American Free Trade Agreement, that support PNTR, the most-favored-nation trade advantages for China, the same people that support trade promotion authority, Fast Track, and now the same people that are pushing the Central American Free Trade Agreement and are pushing the Free Trade Area of the Americas, which will quadruple, quadruple, the size of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Every time there is an economic problem in this country, every time another report comes out about unemployment, President Bush's economic advisers and the President himself says, all we got to do is do more tax cuts for the most privileged, then the benefits will trickle down to the rest of the country, and all we have to do is more trade agreements.

You know what happens? Every single time they promise 200,000 increased jobs a month, and every time these tax cuts for the rich, they do not trickle down. In fact, we have seen job loss in manufacturing every month of the Bush administration. We have seen with this President the first President since Herbert Hoover to have job loss during his time in office.

In my State, one out of six, as the gentlewoman from Toledo, Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) knows, one out of six manufacturing jobs in my State has disappeared since George Bush took office. But every time there is a problem, every time there are more bad news statistics about jobs lost, the President says, let's do more tax cuts for the rich, let's do more free trade agreements and hemorrhage jobs overseas.

You know why? Because the people who benefit from these kinds of predictions, the people who benefit from these kinds of job losses, the people who benefit from this outsourcing of jobs, are the investors. And those are the people, the wealthiest investors in the country, those are the people that contribute money to George Bush's campaign, those are the people that benefit from the tax cuts, those are the people that benefit from trade agreements, as they line their pockets. But it might help the wealthiest in this country, it might help George Bush, but it hurts workers, it hurts families, it hurts communities, and it hurts our Nation.

MERCURY AND AUTISM: A
"PLAUSIBLE" ARGUMENT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for about the past 4 years we have been talking about children with autism. We have gone from 1 in 10,000 children who are autistic to 1 in 150 to 200. It is an absolute epidemic. And we have had hearing after hearing where we brought in scientists from around the world who told us that one of the major reasons for children to become autistic and have ADHD and other mental problems and psychological problems is because of an additive that was put into vaccines called thimerosal. It is a mercury-based additive, a preservative, that is supposed to preserve the vaccine if you put it in multiple shot vials.

Recently, a study was done by researchers from Johns Hopkins University, Northeastern University in Boston, the University of Nebraska and Tufts University, and it was published in the Vancouver Sun. It was not in any American newspaper, but in the Vancouver, British Columbia, Sun. It had a headline, "Vaccine additive linked to brain damage in children. Mercury-based preservative tied to autism, ADHD, U.S. researchers say."

After that came out, there was a flurry of activity over at Health and Human Services, and the Institute of Medicine's Immunization Review Board met yesterday and said, well, there is no conclusive evidence that this is causing that kind of a problem.

No conclusive evidence? One in 10,000 children used to be autistic; now it is 1 in 150 to 200. It is going to cost us billions and trillions of dollars to take care of them over the years to come because they are not going to be able to cope with society. This study is going to be published in a scientific journal in April called Molecular Psychiatry.

This meeting that took place yesterday with the Institute of Medicine's Immunization Review Board, they had the people that were on the side of the pharmaceutical companies saying, oh, there is no proof that the mercury in vaccines is causing these neurological problems.

The fact of the matter is, almost all of the people who were taking that position were people who had a vested interest in the pharmaceutical industry's position. They were getting money for research grants. Their universities where they study were getting grants from the pharmaceutical industry. Many of these people work for pharmaceutical companies, and they are taking the position that mercury in vaccines does not cause brain damage.

But it does not just affect kids. An article that came out just a couple of

days ago said that one in four women aged 55 and older are going to suffer from dementia or Alzheimer's, and one in six men aged 55 and older are going to suffer from dementia or Alzheimer's. So the mercury in our vaccines is not just damaging our kids and hurting our society for future generations, but it is hurting seniors as well.

Something has to be done about it. We have to get mercury, which everybody knows is a toxic substance, out of anything that goes into the human body, especially vaccines.

Now because of our hearings and raising cain over the past 4 years, we have been able to get it out of all children's vaccines except two, but they are still putting it in two children's vaccines. We need to get it out of all of them.

Adults, for my friends in Congress, if you are interested, when you get your flu vaccine, it has mercury in it; and almost every vaccination you get when you go overseas to visit Iraq and every place else has mercury in it. Our troops in the Persian Gulf were getting as many as 11 shots in one day that had mercury in it; and those people, if these researchers are correct, are going to suffer at some point in their life neurological damage.

So I would like to say to my colleagues who may be paying attention tonight, these are pictures of children who have been damaged who are autistic. Their parents have to deal with them on a daily basis. Many of them grow up to be 14 or 15 years old, and they go into fits because of their mental disorder and because of autism. The parents are scared of death of them, but they do not want to put their kids in a mental institution, they want to keep them at home, and they do not have the funds to deal with it.

It is just an American tragedy, a tragedy that does not need to occur if we would just get mercury out of all vaccines, especially children's vaccines. We need to do it now, and the people at HHS and FDA and the pharmaceutical industry need to come to the truth and tell the American people that there is a problem.

I would like to end with a quote from a prominent scientist. His name was Charles Sanders Pierce. He was a renowned American scientist. He said, "There is one thing even more vital to science than intelligent methods; and that is the sincere desire to find the truth, whatever it may be."

So I say to my friends at HHS and the pharmaceutical industry, get with the program. Let the American people know the truth and get mercury out of vaccines.

TOP ECONOMIC ADVISER SAYS OUTSOURCING OF JOBS A GOOD THING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the remarks of my

colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), about the unbelievable report that this White House has produced in which the President's top economic adviser, not an intern who is studying for a master's degree or a bachelor's degree, his top economic adviser says, "Outsourcing of jobs is just a new way of doing international trade. And that's a good thing."

Well, coming from the State of Ohio, I would like to say to this President, bring 'em on. Come right over to us.

The day after the State of the Union address, the President flew and landed in Toledo, Ohio, my home district, a State in which hundreds of thousands of people are out of work, with people where he has cut off their unemployment benefits and has not extended them. They cannot find jobs. There are people in my church who stopped looking. They do not know where else to go.

We have some jobs available to work in our primary election March 2, and I have been telling people to at least apply at the Board of Elections to work for \$85 a day. At least it is one day's wages. The job scene out there is really rough, and it is extraordinarily rough in the State of Ohio.

The day after the President left, the unemployment rate in Ohio ticked up. Then last week, just a few days after he left, another plant closure was announced in Sandusky, Ohio. The little Dixie Cups, everybody knows Dixie Cups, 207 more people permanently out of work, people who have families to support, people who depend on their check, people who depend on their health benefits and people who depend on the retirement benefits that they had worked so hard for, some for as many as 30 years.

What is going on in this great land?

I turned the news on the other night. Domino Sugar in New York City, closing down. The yellow and white bags have been a fixture in our family since I was a little kid and learned how to bake from my grandmother. Gone.

Just north of the line of where I live in the State of Ohio, Electrolux up in Greenville, Michigan, 2,700 jobs permanently gone, closed down.

What is happening under this presidency? Nearly 3 million manufacturing jobs out the window, and the President's top adviser in a written report says that the movement of American factory jobs, along with white collar work, is a good thing.

Where do these people live? You know what? I have a hunch most of them are the privileged children of privileged parents. They do not have any idea of what struggle is really about. And the rest of us who think we know something about struggle have to be polite, we have to be refined, we have to have upper-class and middle-class behavior, when you really want to take the people who took your jobs and level them.

That is what it feels like when you lose everything, when people in your district lose their health benefits.

A company in my district called Pilkington was promised that their health benefits would be there in their retirement years. Now they are being charged \$170 more a month for their health benefits. I talked to some of these folks over the weekend, 80-years-old, 84-years-old. Their hands shake. Promises were not kept.

□ 1945

I would say to the President of the United States, it would have been a good thing had he ever had to work for a living. If he had, his chief economic adviser would not have prepared a report which was in the L.A. Times and the headline read, "Bush Supports Shift of Jobs Overseas." The Seattle Times says, "Bush Report Sending Jobs Overseas Helps the United States." In the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, a city that knows a whole lot about outsourcing, "Bush Economic Report Praises 'Outsourcing' Jobs." And way down in Florida, the Orlando Sentinel, "Bush Says Sending Jobs Abroad Can Be Beneficial."

I would tell my colleagues whose job I would like to send abroad, and we have about 7 or 8 more months to do it. I would really like to see any President who says this to the people of Ohio carry a single vote in our State.

Mr. Speaker, I really am very proud to be a Member of this Congress, and I try to be a voice for the people who have been so adversely affected. I urge every American who is out of work and everyone who is worried about their jobs being outsourced to register to vote, vote in your primaries, vote in the general election on November 2. Let us change the direction of this Nation once and for all.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION SUFFERING FROM CREDIBILITY DEFICIT

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned the administration's budget projects a \$521 billion deficit. What we also have learned, based on that budget, is that not only are they running a budget deficit, or a fiscal deficit; they are also running a credibility deficit. It is impossible to wage three wars with three tax cuts and expect a different result. They have, time and again, whether we are dealing with the issue of weapons of mass destruction, the benefits of their tax cut, or with the issue of Medicare, on point after point, they are running a credibility deficit.

The other day, Time Magazine ran a cover story about the growing credibility gap for the President of the United States. It is all because of the actions he has taken. Let us take the issue of Medicare. We debated here whether we were going to charge the

taxpayers \$400 billion for a prescription drug benefit; and before a single benefit has been issued, which is questionable, but before a single benefit has been issued to a single senior citizen, the taxpayers were charged another \$150 billion, and the administration knew all about it all along. We did nothing to bring down the price of prescription drugs, which are going up next year 15 percent and are going up the following year another 15 percent. Yet they knew all along, while we were debating a prescription drug benefit that will not be seen by a single senior citizen for another 2 years, they knew the bill was actually \$550 billion. That is what our seniors and our taxpayers are going to be charged, and we did nothing to drive down or bring down the prices, which will continue to go up. That was the beginning of a credibility deficit.

Now, the President has submitted a budget with a \$500 billion to \$520 billion deficit that his administration calls "manageable," "within acceptable range." Yet the International Monetary Fund said it is the single largest drag on the economy. Goldman Sachs, the respected firm of Goldman Sachs where the President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget comes from, referred to the budget that the President submitted as "not credible" and "an accounting fiction."

And we learned recently in Ron Suskind's book on "The Price of Loyalty" that the President of the United States knew all along the reason for the deficit. Mitch Daniels said, Mr. President, if you pass this tax cut, you are going to have deficits for the entire first and second terms of your administration. Yet now he wants to blame it on 9-11. He wants to blame it on an inherited recession, which was not a recession, and he wants to blame it on corporate scandals. Yet he was told by his own Director of the Office of Management and Budget that the reason for deficits are his tax cuts, which have nothing to do with economic recovery. But the President of the United States had the wisdom to ask, appropriately: Have we not done enough for the top rate? Have we not taken care of the very wealthy yet?

He knew that his economic program and his first tax cut had taken care of the wealthy, but he went along and decided to once again repeat a tax cut to the very wealthy in this country at the expense of middle-class families who are seeing no increases in assistance in college education, who are seeing no increases in health care, 33 million Americans who work and who have no health care. And he knew that that tax cut was going to take care of the wealthy and drive us into a deficit. Yet he went along and tried to pass it for something it was not, and then accused every Democrat who raised the same question the President of the United States raised as waging class warfare. The President of the United States went along with a tax cut that was skewed to the wealthiest.

On the issue of weapons of mass destruction, the issue is not whether Saddam Hussein was developing weapons of mass destruction. The issue was whether he was an imminent threat, and we were told he was an imminent threat. Now we learn, after having derided and belittled the United Nations, that the President of the United States went out on TV and said one thing, knowing the facts to be something else.

That is why this President now has with the American people, for the first time in his Presidency, when he had the benefit of the doubt from what happened to this country, to all Americans after 9-11, he has a growing credibility deficit. If we listen to what he says and we see what he does, the two things are not the same, from tax cuts to the deficit to Medicare, to weapons of mass destruction. Let us take the issue of the weapons of mass destruction. We will have to have the countries of the world be on our side when we face North Korea and our word must be important.

Then, and let me read one last thing and I will finish, as Time Magazine reported, "Any of those challenges might have been manageable alone. The problem was that each news cycle brought a new question about Bush's judgment and candor, which Democrats lost no time exploiting. Fiscal conservatives have been howling for months about a budget that seemed totally out of control."

Mr. President, this country now is facing a credibility gap, not only around the world, but your administration is, because of its words and its actions.

BUSH BUDGET LACKS CREDIBILITY, AND BALLOONING DEFICIT LEFT TO FUTURE GENERATIONS IS IMMORAL

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, back in the 1980s, a budgetary theory was advanced called "supply side economics." Some called it voodoo economics back in those days. It was the theory that you cut taxes, increase spending and, somehow, you get more money in. It did not work back then, and it has not worked again, because we have supply side economics all over again.

On January 28, 2003, during the State of the Union last year, the President said, "This country has many challenges. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents, and other generations."

Last week, Members of Congress received copies of the President's proposed budget, and it is already clear this budget fails to meet the standards the President outlined last year. Today, my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition, a group that is well-known in Washington for our work on balancing

the budget and reducing the deficit, are going to join me here to outline the dangerous course this budget outlines for our Nation.

This budget makes it clear to my constituents in southern Indiana and Americans across this country that this White House and Congress are mortgaging our future to pay for today. As this chart shows, we are backsliding into a deficit ditch, and there is no end in sight. Look at this: 1989. These are figures where in the year 2000; we had an actual surplus of \$236 billion. We had an election in the year 2000, and look what has happened in the last 3 years. We have gone from a \$236 billion surplus to this year, a projected \$520 billion deficit. It is incredible that this could happen so quickly. In only a few short years, we have gone from record surpluses to these record deficits.

By 2009, the national debt will have eclipsed \$10 trillion. Put it another way, that is nearly \$40,000 for every man, woman, and child living in the United States today. It is simply immoral to strap future generations with trillions of dollars of debt that they did not create. It is immoral to increase the debt tax, the mandatory costs we must pay up front every year to cover the interest of the national debt, that every family is going to have to pay on the debt.

I have a second chart. The President's budget raises the debt tax dramatically. In 2004, right here, a family of four will owe \$4,367. As my colleagues can see, over the next 10 years, each family will go from \$4,367 of our national debt to \$10,368 of our national debt.

Ballooning deficits are going to impose some impossible choices on future generations. Without a show of fiscal responsibility, we will squander away any hope for future generations to address pressing needs of their time because they will be stuck cleaning up the multitrillion-dollar mess we are making for them today. Leaving future generations with huge debts is immoral, but that is not the only problem with this budget. This budget simply lacks credibility.

The President proposes to limit spending this year. That is good. I agree with the President that Congress should limit spending, but that is not the whole truth. Spending in Congress is out of control today. In 3 years, with almost complete control of the Congress and the White House, this side of the aisle has increased spending as a percentage of the GDP every single year. And in 8 years, under the prior administration, spending decreased in relation to the Gross Domestic Product 8 years in a row.

So, yes, we must control spending, but we have to do more than that. We must mean it.

This budget fails to include a dime of spending for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we should make it clear to the troops stationed overseas on 12-

month rotations that we will provide the resources they need, rather than playing games with the budget to artificially hold down the size of this deficit on paper.

As my colleagues in the Blue Dog Coalition have said, we believe everyone, Democrats and Republicans, Congress and the White House need to sit down, put everything on the table, and get our economic house in order, not mortgage our future to pay for today.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

There was no objection.

THE PERFECT STORM

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when we have to come to the well of this House and talk about the credibility gap of the President of the United States. It is the most disappointing thing to have the President issue a budget that is just simply fantasy. He just simply made up numbers.

Mr. Speaker, there is no funding in the budget for Iraq and Afghanistan, and we know that that is going to have to be done. It fails to address the repeal of the AMT, which we know is going to have to happen if there is going to be any fairness left in the Tax Code. Then, he puts out an economic report on this Nation and talks about how good it is to outsource jobs, to shift our jobs overseas. Where is the credibility?

□ 2000

Over and over and over again, we are presented with a report or a request or a budget or appropriations bills that just simply do not have any credibility.

Our Nation is facing the perfect economic storm in a very short period of time. We just saw the charts. The deficit is in a nose dive, and nobody knows what to do about it. The cost of the interest that each family will have to pay in this country in the next 10 years is going to reach over \$10,000 per family, a tax that cannot be repealed. We have the President's own economists talking about what a good thing it is that we are outsourcing high-tech jobs from this country.

Where is the credibility? None of this makes any sense.

The President just the other day in New Hampshire made a speech and said the Federal Government's got plenty of money. We do not need any more money. We have got plenty of money.

Where is the credibility? If we have got so much money, if the economy is doing so well, why are we broke? Why are we losing jobs? Why are the prospects for the next generation so dismal?

When this generation came into office, the Blue Dog Coalition that I am a member of met with the Vice President first. And we said, Mr. Vice President, we want to work with you. If you want to cut taxes, let us talk about it. Let us figure out a way to cut spending so we can make this work and we do not get back in the deficit ditch, because many of the people in that room at that time had dealt with this before, and they knew how tough it was. And he said, You do not understand. We have the majority. We do not need you. We think you are nice people, but we just do not need you. And we are going to do what we want to do, and what we want to do is have massive tax cuts and let somebody else worry about the deficit.

This is the same man that said in a meeting in the White House with the President, Deficits do not matter.

Well, tell that to these families that are going to have to come up with \$10,000 to pay the interest on the national debt as their part. But, again, where is the credibility? Over and over we see this.

Then the Blue Dogs met with Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, and he explained it another way. Also, again, we did not understand. We had these massive surpluses. There was money flowing in the street, and he said this to us, You do not understand. We are going to have so much money, and after we cut taxes we are going to have even more. We are going to have so much money that we are going to pay off all of the national debt, and there will not be a safe place to invest your money. There will not be a U.S. Treasury bond anymore.

I remember him saying that so well. I wish Mr. Daniels was here tonight to face this perfect economic storm that we are about to pass on to our children and grandchildren because I think it is a terrible, terrible thing; and I think it is time that there be some credibility introduced into the national debate, and it needs to be brought to the table by the President.

TELL US THE TRUTH

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to make one very simple point. Sometimes the simplest points are the most powerful.

Families across America are probably eating supper about this time, a little worried about the future of the country, wondering whom they can trust.

Well, just a few weeks ago in this Chamber, we had the great speech of the year, the President's State of the Union message. And the President walked down this aisle in a crowded Chamber, most of the House and the Senate and the Supreme Court and other dignitaries were here. It was broadcast, of course, live on national television. And at this podium right here the President spoke and delivered a powerful message. There were many lines where there was applause; and one of them was this one, because we knew on that day, on January 20, that the President would be delivering his budget. That is a very complicated document. It takes thousands of pages long. It takes months to prepare, and probably on that very night it was already at the printers, the type being set.

Well, perhaps the President was poorly served by one of his speech writers, but one of the lines in the President's important message was this one: the President said on the night of January 20 in this Chamber, he said that "in two weeks I will send you a budget that funds the war, protects the homeland, and meets important domestic needs."

Well, in 2 weeks he did send us a budget. It arrived here on February 2. Most of us have had a chance, especially those of us who have the privilege of serving on the Committee on the Budget, to dig through that budget and find what is in and what is not there. And to our surprise and disappointment, especially after the President's remarks just a few weeks ago in this Chamber on live national television, the budget does not fund the war. In fact, to read the President's budget, you would think that we are not at war at all.

Now, the President's budget does include over \$400 billion to fund our Defense Department, and that is good; and most of this Chamber will support it and support it strongly. But that is largely a peace-time budget. That number would have been the same whether we were involved in fighting in Afghanistan or Iraq or not. So the budget that the President promised us that funds the war, and presumably he meant here the war on terrorism, the war where 120,000 of our troops are currently serving in Iraq and 10,000 of our troops are currently serving in Afghanistan, presumably the President meant the war most Americans worry about when they go to bed and pray about when they wake up in the morning because almost every day there is a casualty.

I think American families want the truth. We support our President. We want him to succeed. We want our Nation to succeed. We want our troops to win in Iraq and Afghanistan, but we need to be told the truth. We need to be

told the extent of the sacrifice that we are being asked to make.

The rumor around here is that we will be asked after November's election to come up with another \$50 billion to fund the war. I will probably support that. I supported the \$87 billion supplemental request that the President asked us to support because we cannot leave our troops hanging in the fields. We have to support our men and women in uniform, and I am delighted to do that. But should we not be told the cost up front?

In the President's budget, which he promised to deliver to us and which would fund the war, he has essentially a zero figure for funding our men and women in uniform. Zero, nada, zilch, nothing.

Well, that is not accurate. That is not fair. That is not honest. I think that undermines the support of our men and women in uniform who are out there risking their lives for us and for our freedom every day. And in our budget, our central planning document for this government, we have nothing for them.

Many of us are aware of the shortcomings of supplies for our troops already. Our troops did not have the bullet-proof vests that they have needed to protect themselves in Iraq. Many of our vehicles, our Humvees and Bradleys, did not have sufficient spare parts. We did not have sufficient equipment to try to deal with the IEDs, the improvised explosive devices, that our troops are threatened with every day.

There are many needs that our troops have that we have not adequately funded and that we should fund and that the American taxpayer, I think, would be glad to pay for. But we have to be told the price. And it is only fair and honest to tell us the price before the election, not to hide it until after election day.

Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans as they sit at home eating dinner, and as we try to do our jobs in this body, want to listen to and believe the President's message, want to follow as much as we can what he asks us to do because he is our Commander in Chief, but he has got to tell us the truth.

WE WILL PAY FOR OUR TAX CUTS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, just 3 years ago the state of our economy was strong. We had just seen 20 million new jobs created. We had seen the fastest growth in 30 years, the lowest unemployment in 30 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, and the first back-to-back surpluses in 42 years, up to a surplus of \$236 billion.

Alan Greenspan and others wondered aloud about the danger of an America that was debt free. What we would do, what we would give to have an America that is debt free now. But instead, our

economy is in a different place. Instead, we have lost 2.2 million jobs in the last 3 years; and despite a rise in the stock market and productivity gains, there are no new jobs. People are searching for work longer and finding less.

This result was not unforeseeable. For years, members of the Blue Dog Coalition warned we were spending money we did not have, that the administration had no economic plan, that tax cuts alone were not a substitute for an economic plan for our country's future. Last year, this Congress voted to pass an increase in the national debt. At the same time we took up the increase in the national debt, we took up a further round of tax cuts.

I remember standing here on this House floor and pointing out the awful irony that in the same week we voted to raise the national debt we voted to cut taxes further. And it was plain we were borrowing the money to cut taxes further. A tax cut that is not paid for is not a tax cut at all. It is merely a deferral of the obligation to our children, to the next generation.

So we have reached an unfortunate milestone in our Nation's history where we have the largest deficits we have ever had, \$521 billion for this year alone, and no plan, no plan in sight to put our fiscal house in order.

In fact, the administration's budget makes a bad problem worse, by failing to include the costs of the war in Iraq, by failing to include the costs that we will incur 5 years from now when this deficit will mushroom, by calling for a trillion dollars in new tax cuts without paying for them.

If your family or mine budgeted this way, we would all go bankrupt. Our families know what it is like to balance the checkbook at the end of the month, the end of the year; and it is time the Federal Government did the same. It is not too late to avoid leaving our children a crushing debt. It is not too late to create new jobs and put Americans back to work. It is not too late to end our dependence on foreign financing of our Nation's debt. But it is time to put our fiscal house back in order, by paying our bills as we go. The administration wants another tax cut? Fine. Let us pay for it. The administration wants to spend more? That is fine. But let us pay for it.

If we have not the courage to ask the American people to sacrifice at a time of war, let us not add the indignity of asking our children to bear the burden alone.

WE SHOULD ALL ABIDE BY SOUND FINANCIAL RULES

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am from Kansas and I go home virtually every weekend. And when I go home, I talk

to my constituents; and they tell me, not in these words, these are mine but I guess it is what I have kind of distilled from their comments to me over the past 5 years I have been in Congress, why can Congress and America not live like American families do?

There are three simple rules that Kansas families and American families follow: number one, do not spend more money than you make; number two, pay off your debts; number three, invest in basics for the future. Of course, the basics for a nation are national defense, some sort of highway system to move goods around the country and make our economy work strong.

The basics for a family are food, shelter, education, health care, transportation, all the things that you think of, that we pay our bills on a monthly basis. And yet we routinely in government have spent more money than we took in, resulting in a \$7.1 trillion national debt, \$7.1 trillion. That is 7,000 billion dollars, more than most people, myself included, can even imagine.

□ 2015

My colleagues have heard other speakers talk about our deficit this year as opposed to combination of all the years of deficit, but our deficit this year is the highest in our Nation's history, \$521 billion, and that does not even include the supplemental the administration says they are going to request for Iraq, which the OMB director, the Office of Management and Budget director, said would be as much as \$50 billion, if not more. That means we are \$521 billion in deficit for just 1 year.

We are spending right now \$1 billion a day on our debt tax; and the debt tax, of course, as my colleagues heard another speaker say, is the interest we pay on our national debt, \$1 billion a day. We used to say, another day another dollar. Now it is another day, another billion dollars.

The interest we pay on our national debt is the third largest category of expenditure in our national budget. After defense and Social Security and Medicare is interest on the national debt, and that is money that could be used for health care for children, for education, for anything worthwhile besides interest on the national debt.

I am on the Committee on the Budget and Committee on Financial Services, and I have heard Chairman Greenspan testify the last several years, and I have had a chance to question him at least once or twice each year. The one question I routinely ask Chairman Greenspan is, if this Congress could do something, what would he ask Congress to do that would help shore up our economy in this country? And his answer is consistent. Fiscal responsibility, live within our means, and that means a balanced budget and when we can to start to pay down debt.

Chairman Greenspan, I am confident if he were standing right here tonight, in fact I will predict in the next 30 to 60 days Chairman Greenspan is going

to issue a stern statement or a major policy address talking about his concern about the possibility of rising interest rates if we do not get our fiscal house in order.

Some of my colleagues are old enough to remember the late seventies. We had interest rates in this country of 13, 15, 17 percent; and that would be absolutely devastating for the real estate industry, for business generally and for consumer borrowing, 15, 17 percent interest rates. We cannot do that as a Nation, and we cannot anymore afford and we should not pass on our charge debts to our children and grandchildren. It is the wrong thing to do.

I spoke to a high school class three weeks ago, and I said to this class, why should they care about a \$7 trillion national debt. A senior in high school, girl, said because we are going to have to pay it off, and her teacher said she gets an A for today. I told these students that is absolutely wrong, they should be angry, and they should contact their senators and their Member of Congress and tell them they are taking our country down the wrong path, to turn us around.

We are the greatest country in the whole world. We are the only superpower in the whole world, but a country like the United States, even the United States cannot be strong and free and broke. We have to turn our country around for our children, for our grandchildren and for America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN MEMORY OF MARYLN LEE MCADAM

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Maryln Lee McAdam, a friend and advocate and a national leader. Quietly, behind the scenes, seeking no recognition or glory for herself, Maryln fought day in and day out for educational opportunities for all of America's young people, especially for the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers. Her guidance and counsel were invaluable to many of us.

The Hispanic community and the education community have had no greater friend than Maryln McAdam. Maryln led a truly remarkable life. She approached life with the unshakable belief that any obstacle could be overcome.

As a young girl, she was struck with polio. Although she spent most of her life in a wheelchair, no one who knew Maryln would describe her as confined to that chair. She was amazing.

Maryln graduated in the top of her class in high school, in college and also in graduate school. Although her academic field of expertise was chemistry, she was drawn to a different specialty, political science.

As with her academic pursuits, Maryln excelled. She joined Paul Simon's campaign team for his successful run for the House of Representatives and then served on his legislative staff. She then moved to Congressman Bill Ford's team on the House postsecondary education subcommittee.

Everywhere she went she made her mark. No one understood and loved politics and people as well as Maryln.

After she left the Hill, Maryln established her own business. She continued her work in postsecondary education and was one of the most respected experts on Federal higher education policy.

But Maryln was so much more than that. She dedicated her resources, her energy and expertise to ensuring that the most disadvantaged children in America, the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers, had a voice in Washington, D.C.

She single-handedly made sure that every Washington policymaker in Congress and in the White House understood and appreciated the value of Federal programs for migrant children, programs such as the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program, the Migrant Education Program and the Migrant Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

As an advocate for migrant children, Maryln became an important voice for education in the Hispanic community. For many years she served as co-chair of the Hispanic Education Coalition. More importantly, she served as a mentor to all of us who are involved in im-

proving education for Hispanic Americans.

Maryln was truly generous. She, like a good steward, gave freely of her time, her money and her knowledge to all of us who shared her commitment to young people.

During my first term of Congress, Maryln's counsel and wisdom helped me as a freshman legislator deliver for the Hispanic community during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Hispanic-serving institutions across the country owe her a debt of gratitude.

Maryln was direct and honest. She could be trusted implicitly. When one asked for her analysis, assessment or advice, they got a straight answer, always polite, always diplomatic, not always what they wanted to hear but to the point and spin free. We could certainly use more of that in our Nation's capital.

A few weeks ago, we lost Maryln Lee McAdam. She has left us with a legacy of service, dedication and a love for her country and the democratic process.

In conclusion, I want to say that she was a leader and a patriot in the truest sense of these words. It was my privilege to know her and work with her; and I will miss her counsel, her enthusiasm and her friendship. I hope that we will carry on with the same integrity, tenacity and optimism that she demonstrated each and every day of her life so that all our young people are able to realize the American dream. May she rest in peace.

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

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

BALANCING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation last week that addresses one of the most urgent challenges facing American families. I call it the Balancing Act because it helps to strike the delicate balance between work and family.

The Balancing Act, H.R. 3780, acknowledges that many Americans have two full-time jobs, one as employee, the other as parent; and it provides the tools to be both a reliable employee and a responsible parent.

Over the last several decades, a socioeconomic revolution has fundamentally altered the American family, Mr. Speaker. When I grew up, we were a Nation of predominantly nuclear families with one breadwinner and one full-time parent. Today, more than two-thirds of all families have two parents or one unmarried parent working outside the home, but our government has

not been responsive to these changes. The Balancing Act brings public policy out of the Ozzie and Harriet era and into line with the realities and pressures of modern life.

Specifically, the Balancing Act will provide paid family leave after the birth or adoption of a baby or young child; make major investments in child care, training and benefits for providers, construction and renovation of facilities, and expanded child care for infants and disabled children.

It will establish voluntary, universal preschool. It will expand the school breakfast program and provide dinners for children in afterschool programs whose parents are working late and make part-time employees eligible for job benefits while encouraging businesses to let more employees telecommute.

The Bush administration could not be more hostile to families trying to perform the balancing act. Their tax cuts benefit wealthy Americans, whose lives are already balanced. They think we can afford to rebuild the Iraqi society, but we have to cut vocational education and family literacy right here at home. They even think we can afford a manned mission to Mars, but for life back here on earth, we have to lop \$408 million from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The administration does, however, want to help the poor acquire interpersonal skills so that they can promote and strengthen marriage, at a mere cost of \$1.5 billion. But, Mr. Speaker, the people I talk to do not want the government to be their family therapist. They want a government that helps create good jobs, flexible workplaces, universal health insurance, affordable child care and safe after-school programs.

No amount of counseling, Mr. Speaker, would have saved my marriage to a man who left me alone and destitute with three young children to raise. I was 29 years old. What I needed at that desperate moment in my life was not right wing moralizing but a compassionate safety net, the very social safety net conservatives seem determined to tear down. Although I had a job, I needed public assistance to provide my family with food, health insurance and child care. Only truly compassionate government policies helped me turn my life around.

If one is a Republican, however, pro-family means that heterosexual marriage is so indispensable that we must spend \$1.5 billion to promote it, but gay and lesbian marriage is so devalued that we ought to consider writing discrimination into our Constitution to prevent it.

The Balancing Act offers a real pro-family agenda for all families. It addresses the issues families struggle with at the kitchen table, not the things they do in their bedrooms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my legislation.

□ 2030

OUTSOURCING AMERICAN JOBS IS BAD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when President Bush campaigned for his election in 2000, he was very persuasive, and he is a very persuasive President, and he persuaded the American people that he was a compassionate conservative and most of us thought he would be. Then he used his persuasion techniques to convince the American people that Saddam Hussein, a bum dictator in the Middle East who was busy writing novels, not worried about weapons of mass destruction, was an imminent threat to the United States of America.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the President is trying to use his persuasion techniques on an issue that will be very difficult. President Bush is now saying that outsourcing United States jobs is good for the United States of America. This takes the cake. Many of these articles have been cited here tonight: L.A. Times, "Bush Supports Shift in Jobs Overseas"; Seattle Times, "Sending Jobs Overseas Helps the United States"; Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 1 hour from my district in Youngstown, Ohio, "Bush Economic Report Praises Outsourcing Jobs"; Orlando Sentinel, "Bush Says Sending Jobs Abroad Can Be Beneficial."

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. This President said in his State of the Union address, "Much of our job growth will be found in high-skilled fields like health care." President Bush's economic adviser said, "We will outsource jobs to lower-wage countries as a way to help control the upward spiral of health care costs in the United States of America."

How can we believe for one second that losing United States jobs, losing high-wage, high-paying manufacturing jobs, medical jobs, science jobs in the United States of America is somehow good for this country?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to please be straight with the American people. In Ohio, we have an unemployment rate of almost 6 percent; 264,000 jobs have been lost in the State of Ohio. On Labor Day, the President came to Ohio. He passed up Youngstown and he passed up Toledo and he passed up Steubenville and Akron, and he passed up Lima, and he went to Richfield, one of the wealthiest suburbs in Ohio for Labor Day. He passed up all of the cities that have seen manufacturing erode and all of the manufacturing jobs shipped overseas, and now he is trying to convince us that losing all of these jobs is good.

Mr. President, look in the eyes, as I have to do every weekend when I go home, and as many Members of Congress have to do when they go home, look in the eyes of these workers and

tell them that their losing their job is somehow good for the United States, them losing their job is somehow patriotic.

When we talked about all of these free trade agreements, and I remember hearing it during NAFTA and the debates during the 1990s, and now the President wants to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement all the way down to South America, the promise always was that we were going to invest money into education, we were going to invest into the American people. As we have to compete globally, we have to invest. And now we have a President who has done nothing on Pell grants, nothing on No Child Left Behind, underfunded by billions of dollars, putting more regulations on our young people and our teachers, school boards and superintendents, not making the proper investment. Mr. President, be straight with the American people.

We cannot believe, and we will not believe, and I look forward to the President and this administration trying to convince the American people that losing jobs in the United States of America is good. This is going to be a great election year where we have one candidate saying that outsourcing of United States jobs is a good thing, and another candidate that is saying outsourcing of American jobs is a bad thing.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a big claim here tonight. I am going to say that I believe the American people will side with the candidate that says keeping jobs here in the United States is what is best for America.

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.)

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

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

HISPANICS ARE LOSING UNDER RECENT POLICIES ANNOUNCED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight very concerned with the state of America under the Bush Administration. On the issues of immigration, education and the budget, this President has failed to live up to his promises. Too many Americans have been left out of the prosperity that this President pledged to them, and his only reaction to past

failed initiatives is to introduce a new series of irresponsible policies. This President has lost all credibility on his agenda; it is clear that his vision is one that is not in line with those of average Americans.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Despite an egregious history of failed temporary foreign worker programs in the United States that have hurt immigrant and domestic workers alike, the President proposes a new, vastly enlarged temporary worker program that will do nothing to strengthen protections for wages, benefits and other rights of immigrant and domestic workers. The President's plan would formalize an even larger class of workers accorded only second tier status in American workplaces and will exacerbate the decline in job quality and job security for all workers.

The Bush approach may just create a quasi-permanent class of second-class citizens in the form of temporary workers whose status is tied to their employer. If they quit their jobs, they lose their status. We need an assurance that they can maintain their status under new employment.

Reforms to provide legal status to the millions of hardworking, undocumented workers living in this country must be comprehensive and fair. They cannot and should not be designed primarily to provide a steady stream of vulnerable workers for American companies. Instead, immigration reform must provide a certain path to legalization for workers from around the world who are already living and working in the United States; repeal and replace employer sanctions with stiffer penalties for employers who take advantage of workers' immigration status to exploit them and undermine labor protections for all workers; reform, not expand, temporary worker programs; and reform the permanent immigration system so that those who play by the rules are not penalized by unconscionably long waiting periods.

The Bush plan does not provide a path for permanent residency for the undocumented workers presently in the United States or the new ones who will enter the U.S. to participate in the program. They will work in temporary status and then be expected to leave the country.

The Bush proposal leaves it up to Congress to solve the problem of backlogs in benefits applications. The Department of Homeland Security has a backlog of more than 6 million benefits applications. The Bush proposal easily could double that number. How will the new temporary worker program be implemented if the applications can't be processed?

Many people are enduring hardships and inequities on account of IIRIRA, the republican immigration reform bill of 1996. Immigration reform must address these problems too. The Bush bill does nothing to deal with these problems.

The Bush plan does not address the needs of young, undocumented students who have lived most of their lives in the United States. Under current law, they cannot get State resident status for college, and any employment they take to support themselves would be considered unlawful.

Immigrant advocates have long held that the current admissions system does not work for immigrants, their families, their employers, or American workers. A comprehensive solution has three main components: permanent legal status for undocumented immigrants already

here, a "break the mold" work visa program for future migrants, and updating the family preference system so that close family members do not face decades-long separation from relatives in the U.S. The Bush plan does none of these things.

I encourage Bush to consider advocating several balanced legislative approaches to immigration reform that are awaiting action by the Republican leadership. These bills include the Dream (Student Adjustment) Act (H.R. 1684); the "Agricultural Jobs Opportunity, Benefits, and Security Act of 2003" (H.R. 3142); and the Restoration of Fairness in Immigration Act of 2003 (H.R. 47). These bills are the result of extensive cooperation with advocacy groups from varying viewpoints and members from both sides of the aisle.

EDUCATION (NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND)

Education Department figures report that over 7.9 million Hispanic children are currently of school age. The Hispanic community is the youngest and fastest growing segment of America, and the number of Hispanic school age children is expected to increase by 60 percent over the next 20 years. The number of black school-aged children is expected to rise by 3 percent over the next 20 years. By 2100, about 64 percent of children are expected to be from minority groups.

Education is a top-tier priority for the Members of the CHC, with funding priorities outlined in The Hispanic Education Action Plan (HEAP). HEAP encompasses programs such as bilingual education; migrant education; Migrant and Seasonal Head Start; English as a Second Language (ESL) programs for middle and high school students; aid for Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and the national dropout prevention program. The majority of HEAP programs did not receive additional funding from the previous year and the Nation's dropout prevention program budget was sliced from \$5 million to zero, eliminating the program.

Despite stressing the importance of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) during the State of the Union Address, the President underfunds the program by \$9.4 billion, leaving many local school districts and students without necessary funding for educational success.

Budget analysis shows that educational programs designed to improve Hispanic and low-income students' performance received no additional funding despite an increased need for these programs.

The Bush budget also freezes the maximum Pell Grant at \$4,050, enough to cover just 34 percent of the average annual cost of college, despite the nationwide rise in college tuition. Many Hispanics, including those in my district in Texas, rely on these Federal funds to pay for college; these caps will create yet another roadblock in the Hispanic community's access to higher education.

President Bush shortchanges education for the third year in a row with historically low Federal investment. President Bush provides a meager 3 percent increase (\$1.7 billion) in education funding over last year, despite rising enrollments and a shortage of resources to meet our education needs. President Bush also eliminates dozens of key programs, reducing the Federal investment in education by \$1.4 billion.

President Bush denies critical services to millions of disadvantaged children. President

Bush shortchanges his own No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) by \$9.4 billion—including \$7.2 billion for Title I. The President breaks his promise to provide \$20.5 billion for Title I under NCLB. His Budget will deny nearly 5 million disadvantaged children critical education services, such as extra help to become proficient in reading and math.

President Bush freezes or cuts college aid, forces taxes on students, and fails to stop tuition hikes. Not only does the President fail to address the rising college tuition, but he also makes college even more expensive by freezing or cutting student aid and taxing students.

President Bush jeopardizes aid to children of military families. The Bush budget freezes all Impact Aid funding at the fiscal year 2004 level, jeopardizing programs and services for children of military families.

President Bush breaks his NCLB promise on afterschool programs. The Bush budget freezes funding for afterschool programs. As a result, nearly 1.3 million children will be shut out of afterschool programs.

President Bush adds new money for private school vouchers while shortchanging students at public schools. The Bush budget proposes \$50 million in private school vouchers. At a time when our public schools are trying to meet the challenges of NCLB, the Administration is diverting resources away from public school students and local efforts to improve public schools.

President Bush makes certain that full funding of special education will never happen. The Bush budget proposes a \$1 billion increase for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This marks the 4th year in a row President Bush has proposed this exact level of increase, placing disabled students at an even greater disadvantage. At this rate of increase, we will never reach full funding of IDEA.

President Bush cuts \$316 million from vocational education and community colleges—again. The Bush Budget would cut \$316 million, or nearly 25 percent, from vocational education. On top of this, President Bush has cut more than \$1.5 billion out of job training and vocational education programs since he took office. In addition, the budget proposes to turn this program into a block grant to States, eliminating accountability and targeting of resources to disadvantaged students and programs.

FISCAL YEAR 2005 NATIONAL BUDGET

I am once again disappointed with this Administration's efforts to truly represent the values of average Americans. President Bush's latest effort in the form of his 2005 national budget continues his irresponsible economic policies that have resulted in so many Americans suffering. This Administration has a credibility crisis. President Bush has said his tax cuts would act as a stimulus for our flagging economy and create jobs; this clearly has not happened. Instead of adopting more inclusive policies this President has decided to give even more tax cuts to benefit the wealthy. This Administration has misplaced priorities that are leaving average working Americans in a bind.

DEFICIT

The most disturbing aspect of President Bush's flawed budget proposal is the soaring deficits that will result from his policies. This administration has tried to say that deficits don't matter; we know that that is simply not

true. History has proven that chronic deficits threaten our economic strength by crowding out private investment, driving up interest rates, and slowing economic growth. Indeed foreign investment in the United States has dried up because foreign investors have no confidence in the Bush economic agenda. This Administration's irresponsible budget policies have turned a surplus into a large deficit that is choking off growth in the American economy.

President Bush likes to say his budget is geared towards tax cuts for all Americans. When in fact the average American won't receive a substantial tax cut, but will instead be hit with a tax hike in the form of an ever-growing deficit. A large deficit means taxpayers have to shoulder the costs of paying the interest on this new national debt. The end result will be a debt tax on the great majority of Americans. This will be a tax on lower and middle class Americans; it will be tax on our heroic war veterans; it will be a tax on the elderly and, most unfortunately, it will be a tax on our children. The truly sad part of the President's budget is that, while it is bad for America today, it is even worse for future generations of American taxpayers.

TAX CUTS

I want to highlight some of the most egregious examples of this Administration's misplaced priorities. President Bush believes we can spend tens of billions of dollars a year to provide \$66,000 tax cuts to the top 1 percent of tax payers, but he does not feel we can afford many vital programs, some of which are even tied to our national security.

Perhaps the most blatant example of this Administration's irresponsibility is the fact that the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) budget was actually cut. At a time when our national security is under such great scrutiny, I cannot think of too many agencies that face greater pressure than the FAA to keep our Nation safe. How can this President spend so much time and effort stressing the importance of homeland security and then cut the budget of the agency on the front line of stopping terrorists from attacking our Nation? The irresponsibility does not stop there; the President's budget fails to provide the U.S. Postal Office with \$779 million needed for biodetection technology that guards against anthrax-like attacks. After the Ricin incident in the Senate Office Buildings a week ago, how can anyone in this body in good conscious approve a budget that does not address our vulnerability for bioterrorism attacks through the mail? This is where President Bush lacks credibility; he has taken drastic, and some would say unconstitutional, measures in the name of national security, but now when it comes to fully funding our most sensitive security concerns he decides it is more important to appease the richest 1 percent of Americans with irresponsible tax cuts.

Unfortunately the misplaced priorities do not stop with out national security. I point again to the "No Child Left Behind" initiative that has been left underfunded by \$9.5 billion—a full 27 percent less than Congress authorized. In addition, funding for America's veterans will be cut by \$13.5 billion over the next five years. It's truly sad how this President not only doesn't fully fund sensitive security issues, but is also cutting funding to two of our most sensitive constituencies: Our children who are our future and our veterans who in the past have

sacrificed so much so that we may live freely. Instead of supporting those constituencies, this President believes that the richest 1 percent of Americans deserve yet another tax cut. These misplaced priorities are evident throughout the President's budget and demonstrate a fundamental lack of understanding about the needs of the average American.

President Bush's budget is threatening to so many deserving American interests. We have seen how this budget continues his failed policies and in fact this budget will further the damage that this President has already done. Because of President Bush's insistence on making the tax cuts permanent, many central programs will be cut. This President will have no problem cutting Medicare to our seniors. It is also clear that this Administration's goal is to privatize Social Security. These policies will deeply affect my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. So many of my constituents in Houston rely on these programs, and this President has decided to take advantage of the trust they had placed in him to protect their interests. The more I go through this budget the more I realize it's bad for my constituents in Houston, it is bad for the people of Texas, and we cannot allow ourselves to stand idly by while this President continues an irresponsible agenda that's just simply wrong for America.

JOB LOSS

President Bush has been one of the worst Presidents ever to take office when it comes to job creation. Simply put, our economy can never truly be considered successful until Americans who want jobs can find jobs. This is simply not the situation that the average American faces today. Under the Clinton Administration job growth continually improved. In contrast, under the Bush Administration the rate of unemployment has soared. In his State of the Union Address the President stated that jobs are on the rise; unfortunately the rise in employment he spoke of amounted to 1,000 jobs created in the month of December. At that rate of job growth, it will take 192 years and 8 months for the economy to return to the number of jobs at the beginning of President Bush's term of office. We are 8.4 million jobs behind where we are supposed to be at this point. That is a staggering number and it should be unacceptable to every Member of this body. The Bush Administration assured the American people that tax cuts would result in job growth. The American people are still waiting to see this growth; too many of them are waiting unemployed and fearing for their prosperity. This Administration has argued that deficits do not matter and that job growth is not an economic priority. I can't think of too many Americans who would agree with that assessment. This President is not in touch with the needs and aspirations of the American people. This budget continues to reflect his irresponsible agenda based on a few special interests.

IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

It's unfortunate that this Administration does not understand the necessity of proper planning and vision. It has become painfully obvious to many of us in this body that this President did not have a plan to deal with post-war Iraq and Afghanistan. That point is exacerbated by the fact that in this entire budget there is no funding included for the 2005 costs of ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is truly irresponsible; our brave

fighting men and women are risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan and this President cannot even provide figures for the costs that these military operations will incur. Does this President want us to believe that the costs for this War on Terror have disappeared? Or is he telling us that he plans to pull our troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan? Once again, this President's irresponsible agenda is being exposed; he does not have the credibility for us to allow yet another flawed budget to pass this body.

NASA

I was there a few weeks ago at the White House when President Bush announced his new NASA initiative to return America to the moon and eventually manned missions to Mars. The funding for NASA has been increased in this budget, but it only begins to pay for future exploration efforts; a detailed plan on how the President plans to achieve his NASA initiatives is still needed. I believe the President when he says he has the aspiration to get America back to the moon, it's just unfortunate that he does not have the proper planning to do so. His actions in Iraq and Afghanistan leave him no credibility in this body to believe that he can achieve his ambitious agenda. This entire budget in fact is riddled with false promises and underfunded ambitions.

This President has consistently asked for patience from this body and from the American people to allow time for his policies to start showing progress; unfortunately time has run out. Too many Americans are suffering and it is clear that President Bush's vision for America is not one that coincides with that of the average American. I hope we will continue to stress the danger of this budget; together we will be the ones to push the true interests of our constituents, to push for a real vision of America.

REFORMING IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to highlight one of the most important issues facing this country and this Congress: how to make our immigration system work for us, not against us.

First of all, I think it is a positive sign that President Bush has put forward his proposal to get this debate started again. I wish he was as concerned for employees in this country as he is for employers. But whatever his motivation, his involvement does put pressure on his Republican colleagues in Congress to at least consider taking action to address our failed immigration system.

The Democrats have also put forward their immigration reform principles outlining the changes necessary to shape immigration policy in this country. The Democratic plan is much more comprehensive, compassionate, and concrete. Our principles put a face to the immigrant who is trying to build a better life for himself and his family while making a better America for all

of us. These 8 million workers are an integral part of our society, and reality dictates that we recognize that and find a fair way to integrate them fully into our society. We can do this while still protecting the labor standards in this country by wage and hour enforcements. We need to take our failing immigration system and turn it into something that can work for all Americans. And failing it is. We have a huge, and I mean a huge, backlog of visa applications pending that are preventing husbands from being with their wives and parents from being with their children.

The current delay in reunifying families from the Philippines is 22 years. Is this a humane system? That is outrageous. Not only do we have to speed up the process; we have to make more family and employment visas available. This bottleneck needs to be opened up. The first and foremost action we should take to fix our immigration system is to bring families back together and allow them to be reunified. Sadly, however, the Bush proposal does nothing to help solve the problem of family reunification.

Secondly, we need to offer a future to those immigrants who have been working in this country for years, have paid their taxes, abided by our laws, and contributed to their communities all over this Nation. The fact is that they are here now, and they have earned their right to stay. While some may not have come through the proper channels, they should not be condemned outright for leaving despair and poverty behind for a better life. These workers have had a positive impact on this country through their contributions, and a guest-worker program alone does not even begin to acknowledge this reality.

Not only does earned legalization take this hidden work force out of the shadows, but it provides certainty for employers and hope for the employees that they can work towards a meaningful goal: legitimate acceptance in the United States. Another reality is that the immigrant children of these workers also deserve a place in our society. It is only to our benefit that they have access to a good education. They should be granted a vehicle for obtaining lawful permanent status and qualify for in-state educational benefits and financial aid.

Again, the Democrats take this into account in the overall debate on immigration reform, but the Republican Party chooses to ignore this quick and easy change that could go forward right away without further delay.

The Bush administration and the Republican leadership also ignore the fact that legislation already exists to expand the current guest-worker program. If President Bush is serious about moving forward on immigration reform and not just playing election-year politics, he should call on the Republican majority in the House to pass the Berman Ag Jobs bill. We can get this done now.

Finally, let us focus our national security efforts on protecting this Nation against real terrorist threats instead of using it as an excuse to round up 8 million law-abiding workers and kicking them out of this country. I do not know about other Members, but I would much rather have the Department of Homeland Security knowing the identities of the people living here because they are no longer hiding from authorities for fear of deportation.

Let us get real about the immigration dilemma in this country, real about the kind of hard-working, sincere people these immigrants are, how they have benefited this country, and what it would take to put the immigration system back in working order. Let us take our heads out of the sand and get to work on real immigration reform. I am serious about the work ahead, and I challenge my colleagues in the House to give more than lip service to the idea of meaningful immigration reform.

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

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

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor tonight to once again highlight several questionable activities by Republicans during and after the Medicare prescription drug legislation passed the House of Representatives last year.

Seniors have already begun to voice their opposition to the new prescription drug bill, as well they should. Seniors know that the Republican bill forces seniors to get their prescription drug benefits outside of Medicare. They have already calculated the supposed prescription drug benefit they would be getting under the law and realize that it is minuscule.

Just to cite some examples, consider that seniors with a thousand dollars in annual prescription drug costs would pay \$857 out of their own pockets; or that those seniors with prescription drug costs of \$5,000 a year would be forced to pay \$3,920. Now I ask: What kind of benefit is that? If seniors are not getting the money, where is the \$500 billion that it is now estimated that this prescription drug so-called benefit would cost the Federal Government? Where is the money going if it is not coming to the senior citizens?

There is no doubt in my mind that both Republicans here in the House and

in the Bush administration are concerned that seniors are not buying this plan. Many of our seniors have contacted us and told us that this is a terrible plan and it is not going to help seniors, and it is a boondoggle for the special interests, HMOs, and the pharmaceutical companies. I think what is happening is the Republican leadership here in the House and President Bush and his administration realize that the public thinks, rightly so, that this Republican prescription drug plan for seniors is a farce. So last week we got wind of the fact that the Bush administration's Department of Health and Human Services was going to spend \$22 million to rebut criticism, and this was stated by the administration, to "rebut criticism of the new Medicare law through an advertising campaign on television and through the mail."

Some may have already seen these ads. I think it is outrageous. I have to say that here we are talking about how bad this bill is as part of our free speech that we all exercise, and seniors are saying it is a bad bill, and the Bush administration has the gall to now spend \$22 million in taxpayer money to try in their own terms, and I quote, to "rebut criticism of the new Medicare law."

□ 2045

I think the American public should be concerned that the President is spending \$22 million of the taxpayers' money, money that could be used to actually help seniors with their prescription drug bills, than trying to rebut legitimate criticism of the Republican and the Bush administration Medicare prescription drug plan.

President Bush should be concerned that seniors are not buying his prescription drug bill, but maybe, instead of spending taxpayers' money to try to rebut legitimate criticism, he should be talking about how he could change the bill. Or, alternatively, if the President wants to use his own campaign dollars, he has amassed about \$150 million in campaign contributions over the last couple of years, a lot of which has come from the pharmaceutical and the insurance industry, if he feels that he needs to rebut the criticism, then let him spend money out of his own campaign war chest from those same people that he helped in creating this terrible legislation. Do not use the taxpayers' money to do it.

The Republicans are saying, and this is what I have heard, they claim they are just trying to inform seniors about the new prescription drug plan with this taxpayer-paid ad campaign. One of the ways that you know that that is not the case is that the Department of Health and Human Services decided to use the same media firm that is working on advertising for President Bush's reelection campaign. We know there are a lot of advertising agencies out there, but why would the Department of Health and Human Services just happen to choose National Media, Inc.,

which is the same media firm that is working for the President's reelection campaign?

It is not a coincidence. Who knows what benefit or collusion there is in the fact that the taxpayers' money is being used for an ad campaign to rebut the Democrats' and others' criticism and at the same time it is the same agency that the President's reelection campaign has hired. But it is clear from this collusion, if you will, this is not a coincidence. The sole purpose of these taxpayer ads is not to inform seniors about the new prescription drug law but instead to try and convince them that the law is not as bad as they think. Both the television ad and the two-page flyer that they are sending out are oversimplified and distorted and I think they are clearly political propaganda that should not be paid for with taxpayers' funds.

Let me just give my colleagues an example, because I have some of the ads now and I can just show them how political they are and why they should not be paid for by the taxpayers. Let me give my colleagues one example of how the Department of Health and Human Services' distortion of the Medicare prescription drug law is played out in these ads.

In one of the ads an announcer states, and I quote, it's the same Medicare you've always counted on, plus more benefits like prescription drug coverage. That is the end of the quote. Any viewer of this ad is naturally going to assume that the prescription drug benefits would be available through Medicare.

The ad goes on to claim, and I quote, it's the same Medicare you've always counted on, plus more benefits like prescription drug coverage. The fact is the supposed prescription drug benefit is not included in Medicare. Instead, seniors have to go outside of Medicare, either to an HMO or a PPO, to get their prescription drug coverage. So the ad is totally inaccurate. It is suggesting to the viewer that you can get your prescription drug coverage through traditional Medicare when in fact you cannot. You have to join an HMO or something like it, like a doctors' group called a PPO in order to get the benefit. So it is not like traditional Medicare and you are just adding the benefit.

I think it is simply wrong and it is unacceptable for the Bush administration to use the taxpayers' money for such a misleading and useless ad and flyer, \$22 million that could be used to help seniors with a prescription drug benefit rather than thrown away on this ridiculous ad campaign.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I joined several of my colleagues in sending a letter to the Comptroller of the General Accounting Office asking the agency to investigate this misuse of government funds with the ads. Because, frankly, I think it is illegal. Last Friday, the General Accounting Office agreed to investigate the legality of the ads and the flyers.

I do not think there is any question it is illegal. The law is clear that Federal law bars the use of public funds for political or propaganda purposes. There is no way anybody can interpret this and say it is not political or propaganda purposes.

It is my hope that the GAO will see these ads for what they are and conclude that the taxpayers' dollars should not be used by the Bush administration in an attempt to sell its lousy prescription drug bill.

I want to talk about the next step. This is what the administration is doing, using the taxpayers' money to try to distort what this Medicare prescription drug bill, so-called, is all about. But it is not just the Republicans at the Department of Health and Human Services that I am concerned about.

Because today's Roll Call newspaper, the Capitol Hill newspaper, includes an article about how the House Republican Conference, that is the Republican Members of Congress, is now coming up with a script described as similar in fashion to the one created by the Department of Health and Human Services that I just talked about that its Republican members could use for public service announcements. These public service announcements again would be taped at taxpayers' expense through Congress' recording studio.

So now we have got the Bush administration through its agency spending taxpayers' money, the Members of Congress, if they do these public service announcements, taping them at taxpayers' expense through Congress' recording studio.

It is going to be interesting to see how House Republicans try to spin this. They have been trying to spin how this legislation was good. Now they are trying to spin how this taxpayer ad campaign is a good thing.

So far, none of this has worked. Because, basically, the American people understand that it is all spin and there is no substance to any of it, and I would suggest that now the ads, I think, in my opinion are illegal.

I am just hoping that at some point the House Republicans would wake up and realize the reason seniors do not like their prescription drug law is not because the House Republicans have not explained it properly but just because seniors see through all the rhetoric and already know that this Republican prescription drug bill provides a paltry benefit as I explained before. Why in the world would a senior want to have to spend all this money out of pocket to get a very paltry benefit?

The bottom line is that when this bill goes into effect in a couple of years, and it does not go into effect until 2006, which is another reason why you would ask why all this money is being spent on ads to promote it when it does not even go into effect for a couple of more years, but the bottom line is that when it does go into effect most seniors will not even take it. They should not, be-

cause it is not giving them any kind of benefit.

Mr. Speaker, this prescription drug legislation, in my opinion, is a perfect example of how the Republican majority has turned the people's House of Representatives over to the special interests and to the wealthy elite; and I think seniors should not be and have not been fooled into believing that this legislation was written for their benefit. The Republicans did not write this bill to help the seniors. They wrote it to benefit the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical companies.

In fact, many of my colleagues, and I have said for months that this so-called prescription drug bill was being written not here on Capitol Hill but instead downtown in the offices of PhRMA, which is the trade organization for the pharmaceutical industry, and also written by the insurance companies. Here in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, the only true voices that matter as far as Republicans are concerned are those of the special interests and the wealthy elite.

I have talked about the ad campaign, but I see that some of my colleagues are here. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), who has been outspoken on the need for a prescription drug benefit and the need for us to be able to import low-cost prescription drugs from Canada. He has been outstanding on this issue.

Mr. SANDERS. I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for his consistent leadership on an issue that is so important to tens and tens of millions of Americans.

I think the first point to be made and that many American seniors are wondering about is, hey, what is in this benefit for me? Is it good? We hear from the President, we hear from some of our Republican friends that this bill is going to go a long way to solve the problems of seniors paying very, very high prices for their prescription drugs and a whole lot of money out of their own pockets. So let us get the facts straight. Let us put it right out there on the table.

If you spend \$500 a year out of pocket, what are you going to pay out of the President's new plan? You are going to pay \$733. What? For \$500 worth of prescription drugs? Yes, that is the case. Because there is a premium of \$35, a deductible of \$250 and coinsurance, copayment of 25 percent from the first \$251 to \$2,250. If you spend \$1,000 out of pocket, you are going to pay 85 percent out of your own pocket. If you spend \$3,000 a year, you pay 64 percent. If you spend \$4,000 a year, you pay 73 percent. Does that sound like a very good deal?

What is even worse, as the gentleman from New Jersey has indicated, because there is no cost containment in this bill, the Consumers Union of America has estimated that one year after the implementation of this legislation,

seniors will be paying more out of their own pockets for prescription drugs than they pay today. Why? Because when there is no cost containment, prescription drug costs will go up 15 percent, 15 percent, 15 percent. Three years from now, prescription drug costs will be 40 or 50 percent higher, nullifying the minimum benefits in this bill.

This is a bad, bad bill providing minimal benefits to our seniors.

I was reminded in the process of how this bill became a law, and the gentleman from New Jersey will remember how when we were kids we went to school and they say this is how a bill becomes a law. I am afraid they are going to have to rewrite those textbooks because let me tell the listeners and my friends how a bill becomes a law in the United States Congress in 2004.

First of all, of course, you have to contribute a whole lot of money to get your voice heard. On June 19, 2002, 2 days after Republicans unveiled their new Medicare bill, surprise, surprise, the pharmaceutical industry staged a fund-raiser for President Bush and the Republican Party in which it raised a record-breaking \$30 million in one night. It goes on from there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman from Vermont recalls, and the gentleman from New Jersey was there as I was that night they raised that money, we were actually in committee working on the prescription drug bill and we had to recess early that night so that they could go off to their fund-raiser and collect the millions of dollars that they raised.

President Bush highlighted the event. The event was cochaired, as I recall, by the CEO of a British drug company, which also, obviously, has operations in the United States. But the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the committee who is soon to go work for the drug industry, shamelessly recessed the hearing about 5 or 6 o'clock. So they go out and change into their evening clothes, go off, do the fund-raiser, come back, and then we started the next morning.

Mr. SANDERS. It is important for the American people to see how a bill becomes a law.

Number one, if you have an interest and you want a bill to become a law, stage a massive fund-raising event and contribute to the President of the United States. That is step number one. I know it is not in the local textbooks, but that is really how it goes on.

Step number two, ignore the will of the Nation's elected representatives. What do I mean by that? What I mean by that is that on July 25, 2003, the House of Representatives, and frankly in a bipartisan way, had the courage to stand up to the pharmaceutical industry and the Republican leadership and they passed strong reimportation legislation which says that pharmacists,

prescription drug distributors and Americans should be able to purchase safe, affordable, FDA-approved medicine in any one of 26 industrialized countries, thereby lowering the cost of prescription drugs in the United States by 25 to 50 percent.

But if you are serious about making a bill into a law, you have got to ignore that. You ignore what the House did, you ignore the votes that are in the Senate, and you say good-bye to that. But the gentleman from New Jersey just told us what you do. You suddenly put into the bill in conference committee language that says, amazingly, that the United States Government and Medicare cannot negotiate with the pharmaceutical industry to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

That is step number two in how a bill becomes a law in the year 2004 in the Republican Congress.

Step number three, and this is a beauty. I do not think the textbooks in high schools or elementary schools have this one. Ram your bill through even if you do not have the votes.

What does that mean? How do you do that?

On November 22, 2003, at 5:53 a.m., the House Republicans passed their Medicare bill. By all accounts, it was an historic night in the Capitol. Under House rules, as we all know, votes are supposed to last for 17 minutes; and then the Speaker gavels the rollcall to an end. Amazingly enough, that particular vote lasted a record-breaking 3 hours. Three hours. That is part of the process of how a bill becomes a law: Ignore the rules of the House.

Mr. PALLONE. The other thing, just to add to that, is that when the 17 minutes are up, because I was here, the votes were against the bill. In other words, there were 218 votes, which is a majority, against the bill. So the bill lost at that time. It is just amazing.

Mr. SANDERS. That is the third key point. Ignore the rules of the House of Representatives; and if you are losing, do not accept that. Just keep going and 3 hours later twist enough arms so that at 5:53 in the morning, I believe it was, you will get the votes to pass it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I do not want to argue with the gentleman from Vermont, but he has got to be fair. The fact is that the Republicans worked all summer to learn how to do this. It was not that they just figured out how to ram a bill through in the middle of the night in November to do the drug bill. If the gentleman will recall, in the middle of the night on a Thursday night in April, they rammed through by one vote a cut in veterans' benefits.

□ 2100

Then in the middle of the night on a Thursday night in May, they eviscerated Head Start by one vote. Then in the middle of the night on a Thursday night in June, they cut education by, I believe, three votes. Then in the middle of the night on a Thursday in

June or July, they did it again. Then even in the middle of the night in September, they passed \$87 billion for Iraq. So they are getting pretty good at this. They may not follow the civics textbooks quite as well as we are hoping they would, but they have learned how to do things in the middle of the night when the press is gone, when the public has gone to sleep, when nobody much is in the press gallery, and then it really does not get very much attention in the papers. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman, but I will go back to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, just a few more steps on how a bill becomes law. Step number four is to mislead members of one's own party, of one's own party who have reservations about this bill. There were many honest Republican conservatives who had from their own perspective doubts about the bill. They did not want to spend the kind of money that is going to have to be spent. So what the President says and what the Republican leadership says is this bill over a 10-year period is going to cost \$395 billion; they can vote for it, \$395 billion. Amazingly enough, 2 months later, 2 months after the President signed the bill into law, he submitted a budget to Congress that put the estimate of that legislation at \$530 billion. Only \$135 billion off over a 10-year period. It is likely many of us believe, in fact, that that bill will cost a lot more because it does not have any cost containment.

Step number five is to stick to one's story regardless of the facts. In the State of the Union address, the President stated that "for a monthly premium of about \$35, most seniors can expect to see their drug bills cut roughly in half." Unfortunately, that claim is simply untrue. The reality is that most seniors will see their drug bills cut by only about one third and maybe even less.

Step number six is to turn one's work on the bill to one's own personal gain. And I think the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) made this point. Here we have the chairman of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce that wrote this legislation, took the lead in shaping this bill. According to The Washington Post, that gentleman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), is expected to take a job from PhRMA, which is the lobby from the pharmaceutical industry, and leave the House of Representatives before his term expires. Another key player, Thomas Scully, the immediate former head of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the White House point person on the Medicaid bill, recently left his post to work for a law firm that represents pharmaceutical and other health care interests; and we were told that this bill was really written for the senior citizens of the United States, not for the pharmaceutical industry.

The last and final point in terms of how a bill becomes a law is to use taxpayers' money to "educate" the citizens if they are not buying their story. Recently, President Bush has launched a \$23 million advertising blitz all at taxpayer expense to tout the Medicare bill. A media firm working for his reelection campaign will get a cut of the pie for buying the air time for the government touting the new Medicare law.

The bottom line here is, I think it is time to rewrite the textbooks in this country about how a bill becomes a law. What we have seen in the last many months, a year, is a shameful process. It is a process of big money buying clout and buying legislation, and it is something that we have got to change immediately.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. And I know he is being a little sarcastic in talking about how a bill becomes law, but the fact of the matter is we can use his example on so many occasions in what has been happening here in the last few years under this Republican majority. And what happened with this Medicare prescription drug bill is a great example, as the gentleman has said; but there are many others, and it is just like the whole place has just turned over on the Republican side to the special interests, the corporate interests, the wealthy elite. And I never thought I would see the day when that would happen, but that is where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I am so glad that my distinguished colleagues are here; and to my good friend from Vermont, I think we should label this Special Order "incredulous," still seeking answers, and I think the history books will be rewritten as to how this Congress gets legislation passed, and maybe we should even write a new book on ethics and integrity and whether or not this House can retain its name because when I came here, and I know that when I go into my district I always cite that this is the people's House, to be run and organized and directed and moved by the people of the United States of America.

To the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my good friend, let me, first of all, thank him for organizing this Special Order. And let me just make a brief mention of the Hispanic Caucus that was on the floor earlier, and they were discussing of course the concerns they had with the Bush administration's impact on the Hispanic community; and I might cite just for a brief moment his plan on immigration. Here is another plan that seemed to not come from the origins of what is best for the people, and of course the gentleman is aware that that is a plan that is called guest worker or temporary worker so that millions of those who are, in fact, hard-working and paying individuals who may have come

here undocumented will have a program that in 3 years will throw them into oblivion, and they will have no pathway and no access to legalization. That is another program that is going to be costly, have no direction; and I would hope that we will all work together as a caucus to be able to promote a plan that works.

I think at the same time when we look at our ethnic communities, both African Americans and Hispanics who are aging in this Nation, we know that the prescription drug benefit that this President has offered to us is a sinking hole, and I might cite for my colleagues that we are already in a \$551 billion deficit. And, Mr. Speaker, we now have a prescription drug benefit that is really taking the lights and we are turning it on because, as my colleagues have said, this bill was voted on in the dark of night. I think every television set in America was off because we were here at about 3 or 4 in the morning, and I think what my good friend from Vermont did not say is that the vote began at 2 a.m. and actually we stayed on the floor for a good 3½ hours while Members were being cajoled and accosted and I do not know what else was occurring to change their votes.

I think it is important to reiterate that at the time we cast our votes, we had defeated a guaranteed prescription drug benefit that was not itself. In fact, it was not that. We defeated a plan that would deny the United States' 44 million Medicare recipients the ability to harness their power and to be able to negotiate the cheapest price. We defeated that. Instead, we passed a \$534 billion bill that is growing and that will not be in place until 2006.

So I want to join my colleagues just to point out to the American public, and particularly to our seniors, that we are not going to forget them and we are not going to leave them now. We are going to continue to raise these issues on the floor of the House over and over again until this bill falls on its own weight and falls on the spear where it needs to go, and then we can finally get a guaranteed prescription drug benefit with life, with sanity, and that recognizes the needs of seniors all over this country.

Might I also add insult to injury, my grandmother used to use that phrase frequently, to note that in addition to the \$534 billion cost and the gift to our good friends in the pharmaceutical industry, and might I say that when the pharmaceutical companies do good things, I am interested in working with them. When they work on a cure or vaccination for HIV/AIDS, when they begin to coordinate with African nations in being able to help the blight and devastation and the horror of HIV/AIDS, I want to collaborate and work with them. But when we have a bill that has a direct benefit and gift to them which says they cannot negotiate a cheaper price on behalf of the people

of the United States of America, then I believe it is time to stand up and be counted with seniors rather than to be counted with corporate interests.

But in addition to that, might I cite, and again I said this Special Order is all about just being absolutely incredulous about what is going on, and that is to find out that \$9.5 million from Health and Human Services will be taken out and utilized by the White House for a television ad campaign to rebut criticism of the new Medicare law. In addition, \$3.1 million will be used for newspaper, radio, and Internet ads in, and I compliment them, both English and Spanish in order to again talk about this ill-fated legislation. Insult to injury. \$534 billion and growing and no one will be served because there is not a real guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit. HMOs will be getting the bulk of the money, the same HMOs that will close up shop when they find it is not profitable to be in areas like Houston, Texas, that lost six of them about 6 years ago or rural areas of America. And then we add insult to injury, as I say, one thing after another; and we are going to spend close to 12, \$14 million in order to explain a bad bill.

I just say to my colleagues I could not miss the opportunity to join them in just citing for the American public to hold their horses, do not give up hope. We may have missed it for a moment, but we will not fail for long because once this hocus-pocus, smoke and mirrors is finally unveiled to the American public, and some people have said we cannot do anything about it, we cannot get it repealed, I believe it is going to fall on its own weight. And we will have to go back to the drawing board and be able to find a way expeditiously, not 6 years, 10 years, to be able to solve this problem on behalf of the American people and as well the growing number of those who will be needing those benefits and who deserve these benefits who served us well.

We talk about the Greatest Generation. I close simply by saying that we have been blessed by the fact that so many are being able to age in this country, and I am gratified for it. Medicare of 1965 allowed that. And I will not stand by silently while we destroy a vision and a plan that would add to the quality of life of seniors in this Nation. And with that, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman because she has been down here so many times talking about this issue which she has mentioned and which I find incredible. We are talking about over \$500 billion now for this program. Where is the money going? It is not going to the seniors. It is going to the special interests. It is going to the HMOs. It is going to the pharmaceutical companies. And now on top of that, the administration has the gall to spend, and she mentioned \$9 million, and I think that is just for the TV ads. The total is

22 million if we add all the printed material and everything else they are sending out to promote a bad bill. It is just incredible. All taxpayer funded. But I appreciate her being here.

I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who I have to say is not only the ranking member on our Health Subcommittee, but he has repeatedly pointed out not only the faults of this legislation but also how the special interests wrote the bill, and now the administration is spending money to try to justify the bill, all for these special interests that really have no concern about the senior citizens. I yield to the gentleman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) would yield, I think we should know this. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) serves on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and he is the ranking member of his subcommittee, and JOHN DINGELL is a ranking member of the full committee, and I saw the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) on the floor.

Let me just thank the gentleman. I think most people do not know the battles, the internal committee battles, that occur around trying to fight for good legislation.

□ 2115

Before I leave the floor, I want our colleagues to know that the Democrats on the Committee on Energy and Commerce stayed late into the night. I think you all were marking up a bill at 12 midnight. It was some days, obviously, before we were destined for the floor, but I know there were long hours.

As I understand the history of that committee markup, many, many amendments were offered to try to correct some of the poison pill aspects of that legislation; many, many amendments, including reimportation, including this issue dealing with the inability to negotiate.

I do not think it should go unsaid the kind of work that was done on behalf of the American people. It is never seen. And we appreciate that you were trying to bring to this floor a credible alternative. If my memory serves me well, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) might correct me, I do not think we were allowed to debate on behalf of the American people a credible substitute or alternative, or at least given the decency and respect, not for us, but for all of those suffering, given the decency to present to our colleagues, who would have voted with us, an alternative to what is now a catastrophe. So I just wanted to thank you and express my appreciation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my friend from Texas and for her speaking out and leading on this and other issues.

She is exactly right. If you remember this bill, a lot of us, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms.

SCHAKOWSKY), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), a lot of us on the committee said that we should include a prescription drug benefit inside Medicare. Seniors understand Medicare. They understand premiums, copays, deductibles. They are not asking for insurance company choice. They are not asking for a choice of slick insurance company brochures. They like Medicare the way it works, choice of physician, choice of hospital, and we hoped choice of prescription drug.

That was never allowed to be debated on the House floor. It is either vote for the bill or vote against the bill.

Several people have talked tonight about how all that happened, but I want to share a handful of numbers that I think really sort of sum this up.

First of all, when President Bush spoke from the floor of this House of Representatives, not far from where the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is now standing, during the State of the Union, he said that this new law, this new Medicare bill he signed in December, fulfilled a basic commitment to our seniors. It kept a promise, fulfilled a basic commitment to our seniors.

This bill did fulfill some commitments, but, unfortunately, the commitments the President had were not to our seniors, and let me illustrate that for a moment.

There are 100 Members of the United States Senate, there are 435 Members of the House of Representatives. Many people in the country know that. There are 535 Federal elected officials on this side of the Capitol and the other side in the Senate. There are 675 prescription drug registered lobbyists, 675 lobbyists, more than one per Member.

In many ways, that tells the story, especially when you couple the fact that there are 675 lobbyists with the fact that the drug industry last year gave \$21.7 million to Republican campaigns, and when you also factor in that the word on the street is that President Bush will get \$100 million from the drug industry this year for his reelection.

So I do not know why the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) or any of us should have been surprised that this bill was written by the drug industry for the drug industry. At the same time, the insurance industry had its hand on this bill. They contributed almost \$26 million to Republican candidates last year. They also get a big part of this bill.

So when the President signed this bill in December, this prescription-drug-Medicare-privatization bill, the President then said the cost was \$400 billion. It ended up being much more than that, which I think they knew then but did not tell us for another 7 weeks.

But of the \$400 billion, the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan organization, said that of the \$400 billion, \$139 billion would go to additional prof-

its for the drug industry. Now this is an industry that is already the most profitable industry in America. They had a 17 percent profit margin, according to Fortune. The rest of the Fortune 500 companies had a 3.1 percent margin. Theirs was 17 percent. It is pretty clear this is an industry that is doing pretty darn well anyway.

But they are getting \$139 billion more in profits under this \$400 billion bill. The insurance industry is getting a \$14 billion direct subsidy from the government.

So it is no surprise that this bill turned out the way it has. It was a bill of, by and for the drug industry and of, by and for the insurance industry. You do not need a scorecard to figure that out in this business in these days in this government.

I have been in politics a long time, but I have never seen this place owned and operated by interest groups the way it is. If there is a choice, if George Bush has a choice between the public interest and corporate interests, it is corporate interests every time.

The prescription drug bill is written by the drug and insurance industry; Social Security privatization is written by Wall Street; energy legislation is written by Enron and DICK CHENEY'S other cronies. Privatization in Iraq, a \$7 billion private contract went to Halliburton, a company that still pays the Vice President, still pays the Vice President of the United States \$3,000 a week; and we have given them \$7 billion in non-bid contracts.

I mean, this place has been for sale. Never in its history has it been for sale the way it is now. As I said, if there is a choice between corporate interests and the public interest, this crowd, TOM DELAY, BILL THOMAS, BILLY TAUZIN, the leaders of the House, the leaders of the Senate and President Bush, they choose corporate interests every single time. And that is troubling to all of us who have tried to honorably serve in this business for many years.

And just to sort of crown it off, and then I will yield back my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who has been terrific on explaining this issue and understanding this, and then to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), now this bill, the payment to the insurance industry, the President signed the bill in December. March 1st, the first of billions of dollars of subsidies goes to the insurance industry. March 1, 2004, this year, March 1, the insurance industry begins to get checks worth billions of dollars from the Federal Government.

But you know what? Seniors do not get this prescription drug benefit until 2006. So the insurance companies get their money 3 months after the President signed it; seniors do not get the drug benefit for some 2½ years after the President signed it.

What kind of morally bankrupt social policy, morally bankrupt Congress, can do that kind of thing to the people of this country?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the amazing thing is we started off this evening, and I am sure we are going to hear from our colleague from Illinois who brought this to our attention, about this multi-million dollar ad program that the Health and Human Services Department is putting on to try to justify this Medicare bill. You might say to yourself, well, if it does not come into effect for another 2 years, why do they even need to start a \$22 million ad campaign 2 years earlier? The ad campaign I think is totally illegal.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure it has nothing to do with the election.

Mr. PALLONE. It is just amazing to think the ad campaign is not only to try to tell people that this bad bill is good, but they have to do it 2 years before it goes into effect? As the gentleman said, the only reason is they are concerned about what happens in November in the election.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You know what else? They are concerned about what happens in the election. The President and Karl Rove, the political strategist in the White House understand this bill has not gotten a very good public reception; and the reason it has not is because the public is catching on that it is written by and for the drug industry and it is written by and for the insurance industry. The public also, the seniors especially in this country, are beginning to read the fine print of the bill, and they see there is hardly any money out of this \$400 billion for their drug benefit. So much of it goes to drug and insurance interests that they just really get pennies on the dollar.

Mr. PALLONE. And the spokesman for the President said, or for the department, which is the Bush administration, said the reason we are spending the \$22 million on the ad campaign was "to rebut criticism of the new Medicare law."

So they are specifically saying the reason they are doing the ad campaign is because they do not like the criticism of the law. How can you say that that is not an illegal expenditure of money, when you are not allowed to spend taxpayers' money for political or propaganda purposes? It is unbelievable.

I want to say the gentlewoman from Illinois not only has been out front on this Medicare issue, but she was the first one to bring to our attention on the floor last week that this money was being spent. But as the time goes on, we realize it is even worse than we originally thought.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this and for this evening to bring to the attention of our House of Representatives just how really bad this media campaign is and how cynical it really is.

I heard the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) talking about the windfall that will come to the pharmaceutical industry because of the passage of this bill,

something like \$140 billion in additional windfall profits. But I do not know even in their wildest imaginations if they realized the taxpayers were also going to fund the media campaign to sell the plan that will bring them the \$140 billion. So we are talking about a neat little \$22 million ad campaign that is beginning.

I am sure maybe you talked about some of these things earlier, but you were just talking, too, about the political nature that we feel is involved in this ad campaign, that the timing has much more to do with an election in November than it does with really educating and informing seniors about the reality of this legislation and what it is going to mean to them. Fortunately, the seniors are smarter than I think some people on the other side of the aisle may think.

However, to add to the political connection, some of us wrote a letter to Dara Corrigan, the Acting Principal Deputy Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, and in that letter we were requesting an investigation of this ad campaign. Let me bring it to your attention.

The letter in part says, "It has also come to our attention that a media firm currently working for the President's reelection campaign has been hired to purchase the \$9.5 million worth of television ad time for this new commercial. National Media, Inc., stands to make a windfall from this campaign. This is the same company that has been repeatedly hired for ad campaigns primarily funded by the Republican Party and by the drug industry. National Media, Inc., has done ad campaigns for Citizens for Better Medicare, a drug industry front group that has spent tens of millions of dollars on ads attacking lawmakers interested in lowering the cost of prescription drugs."

Now, we just passed a new campaign finance reform law that actually makes certain kinds of interlocking consultants and ad producers, et cetera, actually illegal.

I do not know if this is legal or not legal. We want the investigation to proceed forward, but it certainly smells bad when you have the Federal Government, with taxpayer dollars, taxpayer dollars, millions, hundreds of millions of Americans putting money into an ad campaign. I have seen it. I do not know if you have. It has been in the media market in the Chicago area. I saw it on television here in the D.C. area.

That ad campaign is promoted by the very same people who are working for the President's reelection campaign. To me, that is a smoking gun.

Mr. PALLONE. What I said earlier, and I strongly believe it when I say it is illegal, is because you cannot spend taxpayers' money on this kind of campaign for political or propaganda purposes. Now the fact that you point out this is the same media firm that is involved with the President's reelection,

I think basically proves, or certainly shows dramatically, that it is political. In other words, this company is doing ads for the President's campaign, and now they are doing these ads for the department. They are getting paid now by taxpayers' money. So I think that kind of lends support to the idea that this is political.

I will even go one step further, which maybe you will not, but I would like to know at some point, hopefully with your GAO investigation or some other means, we will find out whether they get maybe a little discount on the political side for getting the contract to do the taxpayer-funded campaign. Who knows where this all goes? But it smells. There is no question about that.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The worst part of this deception is that it is going after senior citizens who count on prescription drugs day in and day out to extend and enhance and perhaps save their lives, and it is telling them things like, the ad itself, where a senior says, "So how is Medicare changing?" And the answer, "It is the same Medicare you have always counted on, plus more benefits, like prescription drug coverage."

If I am a senior and I am watching this, I am thinking, here it is, what I have been waiting for, a prescription drug benefit.

The first thing they are going to find out is, no, forget it, there is going to be nothing for 2 years except for, and we will talk about that later, this card. So there is not going to be any Medicare prescription drug plan of any sort for a couple of years.

Then when they really find out the details, some of them are going to find out, "If I join this plan, I am going to spend more on my Medicare." Millions of seniors would spend more if they signed up.

So when they say it is the same Medicare you always counted on, plus more benefits like prescription drug coverage, it is not true. It is simply not true.

□ 2130

The most generous thing we can say about it is that it is certainly not the full story and, for many seniors, simply not true.

Then it says, "Can I keep Medicare just how it is?" And that is a question that seniors are asking. They love their Medicare, for good reason. They can count on it, they can take it to the hospital, they can make sure that they can go see their doctor. They know their Medicare, and they love it. "Can I keep Medicare just how it is?" they ask on the ad. They say, "You can always keep your same Medicare coverage." The thing they do not say is how much you may have to pay for it.

Mr. PALLONE. Or, alternatively, that they may not get a prescription drug benefit at all if they keep the traditional fee-for-service plan.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Exactly. So, yes, you can keep your Medicare, but you

may not get the same benefits; your premium may go sky high because the HMOs are skimming off the healthiest and the wealthiest. And, yes, you can have your Medicare, but it is going to cost so much more. Again, at the most generous, it is an incomplete answer and, really and truly, a deceptive answer. Seniors have to watch for that.

And then, "Will I save on my medicines?" And the announcer says, "You can save with your Medicare discount drug cards this June and save more with new prescription drug coverage in 2006." Do my colleagues know what? Many seniors already have a prescription drug card. Actually, they may have a few prescription drug cards. But under this new plan, they are only going to be allowed one Medicare discount card, which may not even provide all the medicines that they need.

The ad is misleading because seniors are led to believe that all of their medicines are going to be covered. It means that seniors will have to pay in order to get the discount card. It is not free. The ad does not mention that drugs that may be covered when you get the discount card could be dropped, leaving you with no savings, or you may end up in the middle of the year needing another medication you did not know about that is not on the card.

This is a bad deal, and this ad is telling seniors, in a glowing ad, it is a nice ad, is it not? I mean, it is pretty. It is pretty. I mean, it is so wrong. The ad is so wrong. But the fact that the seniors are actually paying for this ad that gives a false picture of their Medicare, which they love and they want to know the truth about, is nothing short of, I do not know if technically so but, in my mind, criminal.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), but of course what the gentlewoman is talking about are the TV ads, but we understand that this is going to be followed up in millions of dollars of print material, brochures that are going to be going out that are basically doing the same thing. So this is just the beginning; the TV ad is just the beginning of what they are going to do to try to distort what this is all about.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a full media branding operation. I am sure all of the Madison Avenue guys are in there figuring out, how many impressions does it take? Who reads their mail? How many people watch television? Oh, yes, it is a very slick ad in time for the election.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the producers of the ads did the 2000 George Bush ads, and it was found out after the election that they did this subliminal message on one of those 2000 ads when they were talking about Al Gore in the George Bush campaign where they put the word R-A-T-S, "rats," on the screen very quickly, so the human mind does not know that it sees it, but it actually was on the

screen and it sticks in their mind without their knowing it. That is sort of the subliminal advertising that has been studied. The guy that did that is being paid by taxpayers and by seniors with Medicare money to do these ads.

That is incredible, considering, as the gentleman from New Jersey said at the beginning that the Bush campaign already has \$100 million in the bank. The drug companies are going to put \$100 million more in his campaign. They are going to make \$140 billion or more extra profits from this bill. So it is pretty clear that they could have afforded it themselves, but they let taxpayers pick it up. It is pretty amazing.

Mr. Speaker, when I hear my friends talk about this, just about Medicare, I know people at home think that everybody is for Medicare, they would not want to mess up Medicare. But one of the differences of the two parties is that my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I think they are intellectually honest about it, but they really have never believed in Medicare. If we just briefly look at the history, 39 years ago when Medicare passed, only 10 Republicans voted for it. Gerald Ford voted against it, Bob Dole voted against it, Donald Rumsfeld voted against it, Strom Thurman voted against it in the Senate. They did not much like it then.

Then, in 1995 when the Republicans finally had the majority, the first thing Newt Gingrich did was try to cut Medicare by \$270 billion and then predicted that it would wither on the vine. So this is a group that has never really bought into the whole point of traditional fee-for-service Medicare that serves 40 million people in this country. They want private insurance to do it. They have always wanted private insurance to do this. That is why they allowed the private insurance companies to write the bill.

But if this bill stays in effect, in 20 years Medicare will not be recognizable. It will be just like it was before 1965 when half the people in this country who are over 65 had no health insurance. Today, darn near everybody does, because we have this universal, beloved program called Medicare. The only people who really do not like Medicare are a few doctors that think they should be able to charge more and a bunch of Republican Members of Congress. Basically, the country likes this program. We should not be privatizing it. We should not be turning it over to insurance companies, because the government has run Medicare so well.

Mr. Speaker, the administrative costs for Medicare: 2 percent. The administrative costs for private insurance: 15 percent. The fact is, Medicare is efficient, it is humane, it excludes nobody, it is available for everybody once you turn 65. It is a program that works. And Republicans, in the name of prescription drug coverage, have set this program to its early death if it continues.

That is why we have to repeal this law. We have to stop it from ultimately

taking effect. We have to turn the drug companies and the insurance companies, throw them out of the temple and come back and write this bill the way it ought to be written.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what really bothers me, as the gentleman said, since the seniors are so supportive of Medicare and think it is such a good program, when they see these brochures and these other ads going out that are going to have the official Medicare, or government, seal on them, they are going to naturally think, the government is not going to lie to us. The Medicare administration, department is not going to tell us something that is not true.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) mentioned the subliminal aspect. There is a certain sort of seal of authority that comes from the fact that these brochures and these ads and everything are actually from the government; and that really bothers me too, to think that people are going to think that this is an official government enterprise, educating them about the program when, in effect, it is just distorted, what they are being told.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to reinforce the point that the Republicans never really liked Medicare, but that continues to this day in spades. When we heard one of the leaders on the other side of the aisle, one of the chief negotiators on this bill, or authors of this bill say, To those who say this will end Medicare as we know it, I say, I certainly hope so.

So seniors have to understand who is driving the legislation and where their disrespect for Medicare really lies.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I give credit to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who wrote this bill, at least he was honest about it. He said, I sure hope it ends Medicare as we know it. Another prominent Republican on the Committee on Rules called Medicare a Soviet-style program. I wish the media would report those kinds of statements, because that is one of the few times that they are going to be honest. But in the Presidential race this year and in races for Congress, we are going to see people look into the camera and speak into the microphone and say, We love Medicare; we are preserving Medicare and protecting Medicare. We know they are not. They are not. They know they are not. That is why they are sending out, at taxpayers' expense, all of these phoney brochures, as the gentleman said, with the seal of government approval to engage in political campaigns with public dollars. That is what they are going to do all year. Seniors need to be warned when they get those mailings that they simply are not true, that they are not telling the truth about Medicare, that they want to undercut Medicare. They are deceptive. They are wrong. They are probably illegal. They should stop.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I think it is so important for us to keep talking about this is because if the Bush administration gets away with this, where is it going to end? In other words, now they are spending \$9 million on TV, \$22 million total. If they think they can get away with it, they will double it. They will triple it. It just sets a terrible precedent. So that is why I think it is so important. I know the gentlewoman from Illinois started talking about it last week. We have to keep at it with the GAO, with the Inspector General to try to stop this, because if not, where is it going to end? It will just continue on over the next 6 months.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey who I know has some drug companies in his State, and he has shown more courage in speaking out for the right things. The drug companies do good things, there is no doubt about it; but they also abuse the public interests in so many ways. The gentleman from New Jersey has always been there fighting for his constituents, even when many wealthy interests in New Jersey do not quite like what he does. All of us appreciate that.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate what the gentleman said. The bottom line is we know that the drug companies do a lot of good things; but when they are not doing good things, we have to tell them that it is not good. Otherwise there is no end to it. I think this ad campaign is a perfect example of abuse on the part of the administration.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, at the end of the day, I really put my faith in the senior citizens of this country. I have the pleasure of being the executive director of the Illinois State Council of Senior Citizens working on issues like this; and if I know the seniors, they will sit down, put pencil to paper, and figure out exactly what this bill does or does not do for them. They will know that this campaign is a sham and a scam; and if the other side of the aisle thinks that this is going to carry the day during the elections, I think the senior citizens of this country are going to prove them wrong.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel difficulties.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral in the district.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of family obligations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOORE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARDOZA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 11 and 12.

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

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. OBEY, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,340.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 11, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6666. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106—246, section 3204 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6667. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the classified annex for the period April 1, 2003 — September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6668. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules, Policies, and Procedures for Corporate Activities; International Banking Activities [Docket No. 03-26] (RIN: 1557-AC04) received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6669. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Deposit Insurance Regulations; Living Trust Accounts (RIN: 3064-AC54) received January 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6670. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefits Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received January 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6671. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Financial Information Requirements for Applications To Renew or Extend the Term of an Operating License for a Power Reactor (RIN: 3150-AG84) received February 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6672. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-15, Annual Survey of Foreign Direct Investment in the United States [Docket No. 030818205-3281-02] (RIN: 0691-AA48) received January 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions and Clarifications to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No. 031212313-3313-01] (RIN: 0694-AC24) received January 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6674. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-313, "Henry Kennedy Memorial Tennis Courts Designation Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6675. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-312, "Police and Firemen's Service Longevity Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6676. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-311, "Distracted Driving Safety Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6677. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-310, "Southeast Neighborhood House Real Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6678. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-309, "Washington Convention Center Authority Advisory Committee Continuity Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6679. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-308, "Crispus Attucks Development Corporation Real Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Assistance Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6680. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-307, "Help America Vote Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6681. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-334, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 316, S.O. 03-2973, Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6682. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-336, "Documents Administrative Cost Assessment Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6683. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-306, "Estate and Inheritance Tax Clarification Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6684. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-335, "Prevention of Premature Release of Mentally Incompetent Defendants Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6685. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-333, "Water and Sewer Authority Collections Clarification Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6686. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-294, "Board of Veterinary Examiners Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6687. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-295, "Traffic Adjudication Appeal Fee Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6688. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-296, "Health Care Privatization Rulemaking Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6689. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-297, "Closing a Portion of Jewett Street, N.W., S.O. 98-272, Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6690. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-298, "Closing of Portions of the Alley System in Square 2868, S.O. 01-4094, Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6691. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-305, "Bonus Depreciation De-Coupling Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6692. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-300, "Electric Standard Offer Service Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6693. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-301, "Closing of Public Alleys in Square 2672, S.O. 03-757, Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6694. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-332, "Neighborhood Investment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6695. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-302, "Office of Administrative Hearings Independence Preservation Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6696. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-303, "Interim Disability Assistance Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6697. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-304, "Child and Youth, Safety and Health Omnibus Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6698. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-331, "Medical Support Establishment and Enforcement Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6699. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-315, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 2848 and of a Portion of Kenyon Street, N.W., S.O. 03-411, Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6700. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-314, "Extension of the Time Period for Disposition of a Property Located at 2341 4th Street, N.E., Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6701. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-316, "Initiative Measure No. 62 Applicability and Fiscal Impact Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to

D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6702. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-299, "Washington Convention Center Authority Term Limit Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the redesignation as "foreign terrorist organizations" pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, and amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, and by the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) of 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6704. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland Model MBB-BK-117 A-1, A-3, A-4, B-1, B-2, and C-1 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-21-AD; Amendment 39-13424; AD 2004-01-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6705. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-24-AD; Amendment 39-13423; AD 2004-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6706. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30401; Amdt. No. 3087] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6707. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Beloit, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16749; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-93] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6708. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Iowa Falls, IA. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16747; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-91] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6709. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Marysville, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16762; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-99] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6710. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Anthony, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16748; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-92] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6711. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Fort Scott, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16761; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-98] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6712. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Benton, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16756; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-98] received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6713. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700 & 701) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-159-AD; Amendment 39-13372; AD 2003-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6714. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-247-AD; Amendment 39-13375; AD 2003-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6715. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, 737-700, 737-800, 757-200, and 757-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-374-AD; Amendment 39-13411; AD 2003-26-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6716. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-05-AD; Amendment 39-13412; AD 2003-26-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6717. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamburger Flugzeugbau G.m.b.H Model HFB 320 HANSA Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-13425; AD 2004-01-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6718. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC130B4 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-41-AD; Amendment 39-13428; AD 2004-01-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6719. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 and -145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-336-AD; Amendment 39-13426; AD 2004-01-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6720. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 1900, 1900C, and 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-16-AD; Amendment 39-13427; AD 2004-01-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6721. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-13431; AD 2004-01-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6722. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-13430; AD 2004-01-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6723. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-167-AD; Amendment 39-13433; AD 2004-01-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6724. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-165-AD; Amendment 39-13432; AD 2004-01-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6725. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-13434; AD 2004-01-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6726. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Department of Veteran's Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Charges Used for Recovery from Tortiously Liable Third Parties for Medical Care or Services Provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs (RIN: 2900-AL48) received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6727. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exportation of Liquors; Recodification of Regulations; Administrative Changes Due to the Homeland Security Act of 2002 [T.D. TTB-8] (RIN: 1513-AA76) received February 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1768. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 520. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 743) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards for Social Security and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries with representative payees, to enhance program protections, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-417). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3783. A bill to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Resources, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 3784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for refunds to taxpayers of the budget surplus for each year of surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida:

H.R. 3785. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land in Everglades National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY) (both by request):

H.R. 3786. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to produce currency, postage stamps, and other security documents at the request of foreign governments on a reimbursable basis; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. SABO):

H.R. 3787. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to require the establishment of an electronic nationwide livestock identification system, to prevent the unauthorized release of information collected under the system, to promote an objective review of Department of Agriculture responses to livestock disease outbreaks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 3788. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to modify requirements applicable to the National Maritime Transportation Security Plan with respect to ensuring that the flow of cargo through United States

ports is reestablished after a transportation security incident, to require the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to develop and implement a secure long-range automated vessel tracking system, to aid maritime security, efficiency, and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 3789. A bill to eliminate the safe-harbor exception for certain packaged pseudoephedrine products used in the manufacture of methamphetamine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3790. A bill to impose a moratorium on payments for inpatient hospital services in additional long-term care hospital beds under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 3791. A bill to provide that no automatic pay adjustment for Members of Congress shall be made in the year following a fiscal year in which there is a Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3792. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a "child only" annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan of the Armed Forces when there is a surviving spouse in the case of a member of the Armed Forces dying on active duty during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on November 23, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 3793. A bill concerning participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RUSH:

H. Con. Res. 360. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the murder of Emmett Till; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 521. A resolution congratulating the North Shore Senior High School football team of Houston, Texas, on their Class 5A Division I Texas State championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mrs.

KELLY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. KIND, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. BONO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. BERRY):

H. Res. 522. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there is a critical need to increase awareness and education about heart disease and the risk factors of heart disease among women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. CONYERS introduced a bill (H.R. 3794) for the relief of the heirs of Henry D. Espy of St. Louis, Missouri; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 180: Mr. OTTER and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 195: Mr. OXLEY.
 H.R. 218: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. REYNOLDS.
 H.R. 284: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 303: Mr. EVERETT.
 H.R. 327: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 338: Mr. CANNON.
 H.R. 343: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 394: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 591: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 645: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 665: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 717: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 745: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 776: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 814: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 857: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 876: Mr. CRANE and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 944: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 946: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1050: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1071: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 1083: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1131: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1205: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1231: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1251: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 1267: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1285: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SABO, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1310: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1322: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1336: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1345: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 1508: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 1519: Mr. OTTER and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 1532: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. CASTLE.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 1633: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1742: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1758: Ms. HART.
 H.R. 1873: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1930: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2062: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 2133: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 2154: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2173: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2176: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 2239: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 2394: Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 2626: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2665: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2683: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2711: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2727: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2728: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2729: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2730: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2731: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2737: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 2743: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 2768: Mr. RENZI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 2808: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2821: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2851: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 2889: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2890: Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 2891: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2899: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 2950: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3049: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3103: Mr. FILNER and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3120: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3125: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 3139: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3158: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3190: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3193: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3204: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3213: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 3220: Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 3238: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3266: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3299: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3324: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3337: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3352: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 3355: Mr. FILNER and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3359: Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3388: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 3410: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 3424: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3425: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOFFFEL, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 3450: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3458: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3474: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 3480: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3484: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3503: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3519: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3524: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3528: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3550: Mr. HOLT and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3563: Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 3569: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 3582: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 3591: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3599: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3604: Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 3619: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FORD, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3622: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

H.R. 3640: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3641: Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3673: Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 3674: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 3683: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3685: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 3695: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3699: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3701: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3704: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3707: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REYES, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. MAJETTE.
 H.R. 3714: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 3715: Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. BUYER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. HART, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
 H.R. 3734: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. McNulty, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 3739: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 3755: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. HART, Mr. OTTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FORD, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3763: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama,

Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3767: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. COLE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H. Con. Res. 264: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H. Con. Res. 275: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. GILLMOR.
 H. Con. Res. 307: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 310: Mr. GOODE.
 H. Con. Res. 323: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BELL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. LEACH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. RUSH.
 H. Con. Res. 359: Mr. PORTER and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H. Res. 44: Mr. BURGESS.
 H. Res. 103: Mr. GORDON.
 H. Res. 301: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. LEACH, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. MAJETTE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H. Res. 471: Mr. BALLANCE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FORD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Res. 485: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 499: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 500: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H. Res. 510: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CASE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. VITTER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. MANZULLO

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 12, insert the following after line 16 and redesignate the succeeding subsections accordingly:

(d) FEES FOR SMALL ENTITIES.—Section 41(h) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) The fees and surcharges in effect on February 10, 2004, under paragraphs (1) and (2) for entities described in paragraph (1) shall remain in effect after that date, subject to subparagraph (B).

“(B) A fee or surcharge to which subparagraph (A) applies may be adjusted on October 1, 2009, and on October 1 of each 5th year thereafter, to reflect any fluctuations during the preceding 5-year period in the Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce. Changes of less than 1 percent may be ignored.

“(C) No fee or surcharge under this section may be imposed on any entity described in paragraph (1) after February 10, 2004, for any purpose other than the purposes for which fees and surcharges under this section are in effect with respect to such entity on that date.”.