United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2004 No. 33

# Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 22, 2004, at 12 noon.

# House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2004

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

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*March 16, 2004.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS CHOCOLA 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 Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

## THE REAL WINNER OF THE SPANISH ELECTIONS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to talk about the recent tragedy in Spain. The real winner in the Spanish general elections was not the Socialist Party or its new Prime Minister or the Spanish people. The real winners were the terrorists who murdered 201 and wounded over 1,500 Spaniards.

The results in Spain's general elections, in which Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar's party was defeated while the antiwar Socialist Party came to power after 8 years out of office, can be almost entirely attributed to the devastating terrorist attacks just 3 days before.

Is it a stretch to credit these terrorists with winning the election? Consider this: The day before the train bombings, Aznar's party was predicted to win comfortably. A mere 3 days and a changed nation later, the Socialist Party, whose main election year promise was to pull the Spanish troops out of Iraq, won by 5 percentage points.

It was an incredible change in just 72 hours. All it took was a note from people claiming to be al Qaeda saying they were responsible for the bombing. Prime Minister Aznar was blamed by his countrymen for the bombings, which they linked to his strong support of the war in Iraq. Now the newly elected Spanish Prime Minister is poised to withdraw Spain's 1,300 soldiers in Iraq.

Spain is not the only country under retribution for fighting against terror. Pakistan's President General Musharraf confirmed yesterday that al Qaeda was behind two assassination attempts against him in December.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a critical moment in the international war on terror. Al Qaeda has long threatened to attack any country that dares to help us. But now a true and valued ally has been hit, and they have chosen to withdraw from the coalition of the willing.

We extend our sympathies and hand in friendship to the people in Spain, but we must realize that the surest way to encourage terrorism is to let terrorists think that their bombs will make us do their bidding. Retreat will result in more terrorism, not less. Appeasement begets more appeasement, which leads to war. We can either abdicate our responsibilities or face these terrorists with steely resolve.

The Spaniards have their reasons for voting out the Aznar government. They have experienced a shocking ordeal and they responded the only way they knew how in the short time they were given. But the people of America also had to vote against terrorist attacks with a threat of war approaching. In November 2003, the American people stood up to thugs like Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein and defied off-year election history by choosing Members of Congress from the President's party who supported our war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that al Qaeda is an enemy of us and Western civilization, not just against our allies in the war who are fighting terror. In the international alignment of us versus them, the opponents are not the coalition of the willing or, quote, Old Europe, not warriors or pacifists. The two sides are tyranny and democracy. Al Qaeda's mission is



Printed on recycled paper.

not about particular countries; its hate transcends borders. As cited by David Brooks in the New York Times today, quote, ''You love life and we love death,'' unquote, the purported terrorist said in the videotape found in Madrid.

We are distinguished not by nationality but that we choose freedom and the rule of law and the terrorists choose rule by force. We resolve our disputes at the ballot box, they with bombs.

Furthermore, just because a country does not back the war in Iraq does not mean that it is safe from terror either. Of Spain itself, Osama bin Laden himself said long ago about Spain, modern Spain was al Qaeda's enemy because in 1492 the Spaniards removed all Muslims from their country. But also Osama bin Laden named Canada as one of al Qaeda's enemies, even though our northern neighbor has been especially vocal in opposing intervention in Iraq. Turkey refused to let us invade Iraq from its territory but it, too, suffered terrorist attacks anyway.

Mr. Speaker, these terrorists may use the excuse of Iraq to justify their massacre of innocents, but the fact of the matter is that their groups and these groups like al Qaeda are irrational and remorseless. They are barbarians and their only goal is the death of the West. For we, the freedom-loving people, appeasement, capitulation, and negotiation with terrorists are not options. How the civilized world responds to this challenge will determine the future of our society.

## IRRESPONSIBILITY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one week ago today, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), told the Members of this body and the national television audience watching C–SPAN, and I quote, ''It is responsibility week here in the House.'' ''It is responsibility week here in the House.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader was only half right. Last week indeed was responsibility week, but the real responsibility was being exercised not here in this House but on the other side of Capitol Hill.

While we named post office buildings, honored professional sports teams, and passed legislative solutions in search of national problems, the other Chamber adopted a bipartisan pay-as-you-go measure that repudiates the central fiction of the Republican Party's fuzzy math: that we can somehow reign in record budget deficits created by the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress while ignoring the consequences of tax cuts.

Do not take it from me, my Republican friends.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members not to characterize the actions of the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as responsible?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Either way.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, do not take it from me, my Republican friends, listen to a respected Member of your own party, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG.) In February Chairman YOUNG said, and I quote, ''No one should expect a significant deficit reduction as a result of austere nondefense discretionary spending limits. The numbers simply do not add up.'' So said the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the most respected Members of this body.

And why do not the numbers add up? Because nondefense discretionary spending represents only 17 percent of the entire Federal budget. The fact of the matter is we could wipe out all domestic discretionary spending, the funding for this House, the funding for the Senate, FBI, CIA, NIH, NASA, all of that. If you wipe it all out, we would still be running a deficit of more than $100 billion.

Yet this week the Republican majority continues its markup of a budget resolution for fiscal year 2005 that utterly ignores mathematical and fiscal reality. By applying pay-go rules to spending only, the Republican budget resolution pretends that making existing tax cuts permanent or enacting new ones are a freebie with no budgetary impact. But, of course, that is false. And if one said it, it might even be a lie.

The truth is this Republican budget resolution cuts taxes while spending the entire $1 trillion Social Security surplus between fiscal year 2005 and 2009. All of it. Every nickel of Social Security surplus, spent. And it would continue to do so in subsequent years.

The truth is the Republican budget resolution would make our deficits $247 billion worse over the next 5 years under current law. And over 10 years it would increase the deficit, already projected by the Congressional Budget Office at $2 trillion, by another $1.6 trillion.

There are a lot of young people who are going to pay the price for our profligacy and irresponsibility. Indeed, this budget resolution proposal, as has the economic policies of this administration, been immoral to the extent that they adversely affect generations to come. And the truth is this budget resolution would freeze funding for domestic appropriations outside of Homeland Security to make room, not for defense, not for homeland security, but for new tax cuts.

For years House Republicans preened as, quote, deficit hawks. Some even suggested that tax cuts are not in fact sacrosanct. For example, in 1997 the majority leader himself, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who I quoted earlier, said of Jack Kemp, you all remember Jack Kemp, he served in this body, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, candidate for Vice President of the United States, he quoted and he said the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said this: ''Jack Kemp worships at the altar of tax cuts. Jack has always said that deficits do not matter.''

Now, this is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the majority leader, the Republican leader of this House. He concluded by saying, quote, ''We think that deficits do matter.''

What a tragedy for our country and for our young people that the policies do not follow that conviction. My Republican friends, this week and next you are going to show the American people whether you are really serious about reducing the deficit you created or whether you are simply taking it and lack the courage to make the tough choices.

Now, when I say the deficit of your creation, let me remind all of our colleagues the first 4 years took us on a straight line out of deficit financing and the last 4 years, for the first time in 8 decades, in the lifetime of anybody older than 80, was in surplus for 4 years straight. So this administration inherited a budget surplus which they said, not what we Democrats said, which they said was $5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years that they had to work with. It is now $4 trillion of debt. That is what I refer to as immoral.

As Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN said last week in supporting pay-go rules that apply to existing as well as future tax cuts, and I will quote again, Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend. The Chair must remind Members not to quote Senators.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. While I cannot characterize the debate that occurs on the other side or characterize the position of the Senate itself, is the Parliamentarian or is the Speaker saying that the quoting of a Member who happens to be a Member of the United States Senate is contrary to the rules of this House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman may be identified as a sponsor of a measure but his remarks may not be quoted.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friends that a prominent American has said recently that our failure to start making some of the tough decisions will land squarely on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

□ 1245

Their financial future will be strapped with the digging out of holes that have been created by our actions

and inactions. I agree with that sentiment, and let me add that our failure to make the tough decisions also threatens the very future of Social Security and Medicare, two programs which now keep millions and millions and millions of Americans out of poverty.

Next week, Democrats will propose a budget plan that meets America's priorities and gets our financial house back in order. I urge all of my colleagues to support it because it is intellectually the right thing to do. From a fiscal policy, it is the right thing to do, and from a moral values, pro-family perspective, it is the right thing to do. It is time we delivered real responsibility this week to the American public.

## SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for Congress and the President to be responsible. I object to the suggestion that somehow government can control the economy and decide whether it is a strong economy or there is good job growth. Government gets in the way every time.

Let me suggest this, Mr. Speaker. If the best possible economic advisors could simply be taken to governments around the world, and with their advice the economy would be strong, job growth would be strong, every country in the world would hire the best possible economists to have a strong economy. The fact is we have a cyclical situation, and for the last several years we have had a worldwide slump in the economy. Europe is even having a more dangerous downturn. In terms of doing some of the things that we should do, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is government getting out of the way and not imposing rules and regulations and taxes that put our businesses at a competitive disadvantage to other businesses throughout the world. We should not be taxing our business in the United States 20 percent more than what other countries, our competitors, are charging their business. It means that we should not have all of these overzealous regulations to impose extra costs on our business that other countries do not have.

The challenge for our kids and our grandkids is going to be huge. Overspending is part of that problem; but not dealing with the unfunded liabilities, not dealing with some of the huge challenges that are going to be faced by our kids and our grandkids is another area where Congress and the White House need to consider.

I would like to bring to mind Social Security. We have known for the last 14 years that Social Security was facing tough times. We passed a Social Security Reform Act from the Greenspan Commission in 1983. We dramatically increased the taxes and reduced benefits. I bring this chart to the floor, Mr. Speaker, because I want to call to everyone's attention the danger of not doing something in this House and in the Senate and in the White House to correct the Social Security problem.

Social Security is going broke. I just read an article, that it is no big deal because Social Security is not going to become insolvent technically until 2036, because that is how much money is in the trust funds; and if we pay that money back that government has borrowed, then there will not be any problem. But here is the problem and here is the situation, and we are looking for the actuary Social Security Commission report to come out next week.

We are looking at a situation where by 2017 there will be less money coming in from Social Security taxes than is needed to pay benefits. What do we do then? We have got these IOUs that government has taken some of this extra money and spent it for other government expenditures; but that means we have either got to borrow more money or reduce benefits or increase taxes. I just want to report to my colleagues what government has done in the past.

We started out with a Social Security tax of 1 percent on payroll. By 1940, we decided that was not quite enough money; we raised it to 2 percent on the first $3,000. By 1960, we were short of money again. We decided to raise that tax again to 6 percent on the first $4,800. By 1980, we raised it again to 10.16 percent on the first $25,900. In the year 2000, 12.4 percent on the first $76,000. Now it is 12.4 percent on $89,000.

So the dangers of doing nothing is that we increase taxes or reduce benefits. So I plead with my colleagues, stand up and do what is right. Do not demagogue somebody's suggestion of a bill by saying that person is going to ruin your Social Security so do not elect them.

I would call, Mr. Speaker, on every voter at every chance they have to go to a forum of individuals running for Congress or for the Presidency, and ask what bill have they offered or signed on to that is going to make sure that Social Security stays solvent.

I have done this since I first came to Congress 12 years ago, all scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent. I chaired a bipartisan Social Security task force of Republicans and Democrats. By the time we spent a year studying the problem, we all agreed that we needed to do something very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the White House, the President, and Members of the House and the Senate to move ahead to make sure we save this important program.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to others outside the Chamber.

## BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES BEHIND THE BUDGET

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Maryland has talked about the budget that was supposed to come out this week, but is now apparently languishing someplace in the back room on the Republican side. The problem apparently is that some want to spend money and some do not, and they cannot agree among themselves and there is going to have to be some twisting and turning before it all happens.

So while we are in that period of waiting for them, I thought that since many in this House have begun to show an interest in Biblical principles on which this country should be run, and certainly on which the government of the United States should operate, I thought it would be good to talk about the Biblical principles behind the budget.

There are a lot of people who want to talk about the Christian teaching and so forth, as though it were an issue of right and wrong and those kinds of things, but if we look carefully at what went on in the New Testament, certainly there is an awful lot of talk about social justice.

There was a day when Christ brought all the people to the mountain and said, I am going to give you a little talk here; it is called the Sermon on the Mount. It is in Matthew 25, for those of my colleagues who have a Bible and read it on a regular basis. They might go and read it. Sort of the latter part of that chapter they will find the instructions that Jesus gave to the people.

A budget is how a society makes a statement about what it really cares about. If we spend our money on military, well that is clearly what we care about. If we spend our money on education, that is another kind of priority. So as the House gets ready to write a budget, we are going to set the priorities of this body for this country for the next year.

Christ started out by talking about feeding people. He said, when somebody's hungry, feed them because when you do that, you feed them in my name. He made it a Biblical priority to do this. Nobody should be hungry. All we have to do is look in this country and look at the problems we have in obesity and all the other things, and we see that this country has problems

with nutrition, and certainly the rest of the world does.

There is no problem with food in the world. We make enough. We grow enough. It is a matter of distribution. Maybe the priorities should be for a little bit more to USAID so that they can spread food across the world in places where people are hungry, rather than selling them arms. I mean, USAID is supposed to be an aid organization, and one would think that they would aid people in what they really need. Do they need to sell them arms, or do they need to get food to them?

Another thing is housing. Christ talked about the fact that some people were homeless. I mean, that word's right there in the Bible, and in this country we have many homeless people. I live in a city where there are so many homeless families that we have one school that is designated as the school where the homeless kids are all brought. From all the shelters all over the city, they are picked up by buses and brought to one school. The city of Seattle has institutionalized an acceptance of homelessness. What has happened in housing since 1980 to today is stupendous. We have spent practically nothing in housing over the 15 years that I have been in the Congress. It was once $40 billion in the budget. Now it is down somewhere under $10 billion, and we have homeless all over this country.

We have got plenty of money to put up a nuclear missile shield. I do not remember that being in the Sermon on the Mount. I cannot remember if He said you were supposed to put a nuclear missile shield or build bigger arms or what it was. No, of course, He did not. He talked about the homeless. If we want a Biblical perspective on this State and this country and this body, we ought to think about what Christ actually said.

He also talked about clothing people. There should not be any problem with anybody not having warm clothes, and we should not have people freezing to death and all these kinds of things that happen in the world; but, no, we have to build arms.

Then healing, the President talks about universal health care for Iraq, but not for the United States.

Put the budget together on the basis of the principles of the Bible, and I will vote for it.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

## AFTER RECESS

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

## PRAYER

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

The fool, the terrorist, says in his heart, ''There is no God.'' Blinded by anger and deafened by a cause, his deeds are corrupt and depraved. Because there is only emptiness inside, innocence and goodness need to be destroyed.

From heaven You look down, O Lord, on all humanity's children. You seek out those who are wise; love those who seek You; and become the refuge of the just.

Will evil doers ever come to understand? They slaughter Your people like animals and devour Your heirs like bread. They cannot pray to a living God.

They mock the poor man's hope and with explosives create only fear.

But we will persevere in our living and saving faith. We know that You, O Lord, will deliver Your people from bondage. And when there is peace we will rejoice and gather Jew, Christian and Muslim together to give You glory forever and ever. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PITTS 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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1904. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 400 North Miami Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the ''Wilkie D. Ferguson, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

S. 2022. An act to designate the Federal building located at 250 West Cherry Street in Carbondale, Illinois the ''Senator Paul Simon Federal Building''.

S. 2043. An act to designate a Federal building in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the ''Ronald Reagan Federal Building''.

S. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

## IRAQ ONE YEAR LATER

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

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, one year after the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, our mission in Iraq has been an unqualified success. Saddam Hussein's regime is no more. Its senior officials are in prison, and the people of Iraq have been liberated. An interim constitution, one of the most progressive in the Middle East, has been signed. Free elections and self-determination are on their way. Americans and Iraqis and free people the world over are reaping the benefits of regime change in Baghdad. There is no ''yes, but'' in this calculation, Madam Speaker.

The world is at war and whether we want to be a part of it or not, we are a target. Our freedom is a target. Our prosperity is a target. We are hated by our enemies, not for any strategic or diplomatic reason but for issues of culture, religious extremism and ideology. No amount of appeasement or international hand-holding will end this threat. The only thing that will is making relentless war on our enemies, on every front and with every weapon available to us, until the last terrorist on earth is either in a cell or in a cemetery.

Our intervention and victory in Iraq have been absolute goods for mankind and for mankind's war against terror. Those who supported our action were right, and those who opposed us were wrong.

This week, Madam Speaker, the House will take up a resolution commemorating the first anniversary of Operation Iraqi Freedom, acknowledging its success and commending the Iraqi people on their hopeful march to freedom. This resolution, this opportunity to restate the United States' commitment to winning the war on terror, is all the more important for its timing, coming only days after the largest terrorist attack in Spanish history.

Madam Speaker, last week's violence reminded us all that the world is still at war, whether it feels like it every day or not, and the only way to win the war on terror is to remain vigilant in its execution. This week, we will have an opportunity to reaffirm our support for our troops, for our victories and for the liberated people of Afghanistan and Iraq.

I encourage everyone to read the resolution, put politics aside, and work towards its unanimous approval.

## TRAGEDY IN SPAIN SHOULD REINFORCE OUR RESOLVE

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, what happened in Spain last week was a

tragedy of the highest proportion. Our deepest condolences go out to the families who lost loved ones in that devastating attack. And we continue to stand with Spain in finding those responsible for this heinous attack. But I am troubled by the results of the weekend's election. The results of the election were influenced not by debate and campaigns but by bombs and terror. The message is that terrorists can control elections and policy with fear. Until now, Spain's leadership has understood that a peaceful, democratic Iraq would be a deathblow to terrorists around the world. Success in Iraq is success in the war on terror. The American people understand that as well. That is why they boycotted countries that sided with Saddam Hussein. I hope that Americans will not start dumping Spanish wine or changing travel plans or boycotting Spanish goods in protest, but if Spain withdraws its troops from Iraq, the message will be, terrorism works.

Fear and intimidation is the native language of terrorists. They only understand strength. Anything less does not pacify them. It only encourages them.

## THE CAMPAIGN FOR PRESIDENT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, last week the leading Democrat Presidential nominee called the Bush administration a bunch of crooks and liars. Not one single Democrat stood up to say, ''Mr. KERRY, you've gone too far.'' An apology is in order.

And now this week the quote of the month was that he is saying that leading international leaders are asking him to become President of the United States, saying that you, quote, have to beat this guy. I am sure that was the case a year ago when Saddam Hussein was the leader of Iraq. I am sure he would prefer somebody besides George Bush in the White House. And I am sure the same thing could be said in Afghanistan with the Taliban and Mullah Omar. I am sure they would prefer somebody besides George Bush in the White House.

But the ridiculous thing is that here we are at war. And while we have a candidate from the Democrat side who wants to call the President of the United States a crook and a liar, do you not think it is a slap in the face to the troops to be saying that then the foreign international leaders want somebody else to be President, they want me to be President? Of course it is ironic when asked who these were, no names came forward. What meetings has he attended? None are on his calendar. What trips has he taken? None since 2002. I guess it is just going to be a year of hot rhetoric until Bush gets reelected.

## INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LEGISLATION PASSES HOUSE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, three intellectual property bills have passed the House in the last 2 weeks. They were based on two principles essential to a democracy: the protection of intellectual property rights and the freedom to exchange goods and services in the marketplace. The Patent and Trademark Office Fee Act protects the rights of American inventors, from the lone individual working in their garage, to the small business person with a breakthrough idea, to the large high-tech company that applies for hundreds of patents. The Copyright Royalty and Distribution Reform Act benefits artists, songwriters, music publishers and Web casters. The Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act allows researchers and inventors who work for different organizations to share information without losing the ability to file for a patent.

These three bills await action in the Senate where I hope they will become law. American jobs and profits are at stake.

## AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA BY JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 93

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

**SECTION 1. USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL BY THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.**

The rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used on January 20, 2005, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I support S. Con. Res. 93, which authorizes planning for the use of the Capitol Rotunda on January 20, 2005, for the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States. We traditionally pass this measure to begin the period of security planning and rehearsal for the inaugural, since the Rotunda is routinely used for ceremonial purposes during the inauguration and could host the event itself, depending on the weather at that time.

The 108th Congress does not formally authorize use of the Rotunda through this measure, since it will expire on January 3, 2005, like all concurrent resolutions which are not made part of permanent law and must be renewed in the 109th Congress. However, it initiates the period of pre-event planning necessary to bring one of our democracy's most memorable and historic ceremonies to fruition smoothly and safely. I urge its adoption.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of S. Con. Res. 93, the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

## ESTABLISHING JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) establishing the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON RES. 94

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

**SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.**

There is established a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies (in this resolution referred to as the ''joint committee''), consisting of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively. The joint committee is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

**SEC. 2. SUPPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.**

The joint committee—

(1) is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between the joint committee and the heads of the departments and agencies, in connection with the inaugural proceedings and ceremonies; and

(2) may accept gifts and donations of goods and services to carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con. Res. 94, the traditional measure which establishes the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies during the 108th Congress to begin work on preparations for the presidential inaugural ceremonies at the Capitol on January 20, 2005. The joint committee we are creating today expires on January 3, 2005, but will be renewed at the start of the 109th Congress to conclude its work.

Congress routinely passes this concurrent resolution every 4 years at about this time. The Speaker, majority leader and minority leader are customarily appointed by the Speaker to represent the House on the joint committee.

I urge adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of S. Con. Res. 94, the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 94, 108th Congress, and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies:

Mr. HASTERT, Illinois;
Mr. DELAY, Texas;
Ms. PELOSI, California.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, March 15, 2004.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*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, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 15, 2004, at 9:25 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3724.

That the Senate agreed to House amendment S. 1881.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
*Clerk.*

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, January 30, 2004.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to respectfully submit my resignation effective today from the Board of Visitors of the United States Air Force Academy.

It has been an honor and a privilege to represent you, the United States Congress and the House Appropriations Committee on the Board. Unfortunately, with my responsibilities as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have found it increasingly difficult to attend the Board meetings. Therefore, and after much thought, I have decided to resign my position so that you can appoint another member of the Committee who has more available time to devote more attention to this important Board.

The Air Force Academy is an outstanding institution and the Congressional oversight provided by the members you appoint to the Board is very important to its mission of training the finest Air Force officers in the world. Thank you again for the opportunity you have given me to serve on the Board.

With best wishes and personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

C.W. BILL YOUNG,
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a) and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Ms. GRANGER, Texas.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

## THANKING C–SPAN FOR ITS SERVICE ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FIRST COVERAGE OF PROCEEDINGS OF HOUSE

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 551) thanking C–SPAN for its service to the House of Representatives on the 25th anniversary of its first coverage of the proceedings of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 551

Whereas C–SPAN (Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network) is a nonprofit educational organization created in 1979 through the vision of Brian Lamb in order to provide live, gavel-to-gavel coverage of the House of Representatives to the American people;

Whereas on March 19, 1979, the House of Representatives turned on its cameras, and for the first time C–SPAN and its staff of just 4 people brought the live proceedings of the House into 3.5 million American homes;

Whereas in 1980, C–SPAN covered its first Presidential election and created one of the first nationwide viewer call-in programs;

Whereas by 1982, C–SPAN's schedule expanded to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week;

Whereas in June 1986, C–SPAN2 was created to broadcast live coverage of the Senate;

Whereas by 1990, C–SPAN broadcast to 50 million American households, and this number expanded to 60 million households just three years later in 1993;

Whereas in January 1997, C–SPAN launched live web coverage of the House and Senate proceedings on the Internet;

Whereas today, C–SPAN has a staff of 275, its around-the-clock programming is available to 86 million households via 7,900 cable systems, and an estimated 28,000,000 people watch C–SPAN each week; and

Whereas while only 51 percent of Americans voted in the 2000 election, surveys show that percentage of regular C–SPAN viewers who voted in the election was 90 percent: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses the thanks of the House of Representatives to the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network (C–SPAN) for its service to the House on the 25th anniversary of its first coverage of the proceedings of the House;

(2) recognizes that for 25 years C–SPAN has met, and continues to meet each day, its mission of providing the Members of the House with a direct, unfiltered conduit to the American people on whose behalf they go to work every day, and in turn has provided direct access for the American people to their elected officials through call-in and other programs;

(3) recognizes that since its inception 25 years ago, C–SPAN has forever changed the face of American political life, provided tremendous benefits to the American people and their elected officials, and has had a significant positive impact on the American democracy;

(4) expresses its deep gratitude to Brian Lamb and the more than 275 C–SPAN employees who bring the proceedings of the House into the homes of tens of millions of Americans each day; and

(5) commends C–SPAN and its employees for a tremendous 25 years of service to the American people and the Federal Government.

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

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

□ 1415

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

Madam Speaker, I rise here today in support of House Resolution 551, a bill honoring Brian Lamb and C–SPAN's Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network for 25 years of service to the United States House of Representatives. Obviously, we all know today, Madam

Speaker, about the importance of technology and the media in order to get the message out to millions of Americans, and frankly millions of people around the world, of what is occurring here on the floor of the people's House. It is, I think, an important endeavor to be able to use technology, in fact, to bring the people's message into living rooms, again, not only in the United States but around the world. We have watched technology be a great tool of progress, in fact, for this Chamber and for the people, from the electronic voting board that was created under Chairman Wayne Hayes, the late Wayne L. Hayes, who was my Congressman from Belmont County, Ohio, when they automated the electronic voting board to save time in voting. And then we look into the late 1970s; and on March 19, 1979, with a staff of just four employees, C–SPAN first began broadcasting gavel-to-gavel coverage of the proceedings of the House of Representatives to millions of American households. So once again the Chamber was coming into the modern era with the use of technology.

Over the next quarter century, C–SPAN expanded its programming scope to include events and interviews featuring influential politicians, statespeople, scholars, and authors and provides opportunities for viewers to call and express their thoughts on important public policy matters. In addition, C–SPAN2 was created to furnish coverage of the U.S. Senate.

C–SPAN has become an essential tool in our country for fostering civic education and governmental accountability. It is now our turn today, Madam Speaker, and I am happy to be here with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), our distinguished ranking member, who cares deeply about the institution of the House and also about technology and the openness of the House to make itself available to the American people and to the world. So it is a pleasure to join our ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), in honoring C–SPAN's founder, Brian Lamb, for his vision and public spiritedness.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not point out that downstairs is a House recording studio; and at that recording studio, there are employees of the U.S. House who, in fact, operate the cameras and provide the great service that then allows C–SPAN to take the feed from these cameras and to broadcast. So I want to thank our staff of the U.S. House.

But, again, it is a pleasure and an honor to be here today with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and my other colleagues who cosponsored this legislation. Such interest in this legislation proves the extent to which C–SPAN has truly become the indispensable institution in our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge full support of House Resolution 551.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from Ohio and support this motion and associate myself with his remarks.

In the quarter century since its inception, C–SPAN has become an institution. No organization has done more to enhance America's understanding of its government, its history than the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network. More than 85 million households have access to C–SPAN today, and millions regularly tune in to see their government in action. That is the way it should be.

The gentleman from Ohio mentioned the outstanding contribution of Brian Lamb, and truly we should acknowledge the great efforts in his vision to bring government to the households of every single American. I am proud to say as well that in the State of Connecticut is CT–N, which again is modeled after C–SPAN, which provides an opportunity to view the local legislative bodies and municipalities and actions so, in fact, people from their homes, especially many who are inbound, get an opportunity to participate in government on a regular basis.

Madam Speaker, today, especially on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, it is great to acknowledge the true father of C–SPAN in this Chamber and that is the legendary Speaker Tip O'Neill. Tip O'Neill was fond of saying that social policies brought many poor into the great American tent of opportunity. During his years as Speaker, many Americans were brought into the Halls of Congress via television. His decision to support televised coverage of the House of Representatives ushered in a new era of government accessibility. House TV went through its growing pains, but its success eventually influenced the Senate to follow suit, voting to let itself be televised in 1986.

When future generations remember Tip O'Neill, the man who served the longest consecutive term as Speaker, they may well remember him as the man who let Americans see their government at work as well.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague in support of his motion. In the quarter-century since its inception, C–SPAN has become an institution. No organization has done more to enhance Americans' understanding of their government and history than the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network. More than 85 million households have access to C–SPAN today, and millions regularly tunein to see their government in action. This is as it should be.

Like microwave ovens, cellular telephones, the Internet, and other developments of this modern age, C–SPAN has become part of daily life for millions of Americans. Not only would we notice immediately if C–SPAN disappeared, most of us can't remember how we lived without it.

Think of it Madam Speaker. Before Brian Lamb transformed his vision of a television network devoted solely to public affairs into reality, Americans unable to visit the House gallery had to rely on others' reports about what their representatives said and did here. On March 19, 1979, all that changed. Beginning on that date, Americans could see and hear for themselves, immediately, directly, and unfiltered by others.

And while Americans may at times have disagreed with what they have seen or heard on the House floor since them, there is no question that Americans appreciate C–SPAN, and the cable-television industry, for enabling them to see and hear it. I know I was grateful for the opportunity to appear on C–SPAN for the first time on July 26, 2001, to talk about fuel cell technology.

Look how far C–SPAN has come in the past quarter-century. On that first day, four employees could broadcast gavel-to-gavel coverage of House proceedings, over one network initially available to fewer than 4 million homes.

Today, C–SPAN offers government and politics coverage over three television networks, one radio network, and over its website, c-span.org, all of it round-the-clock and accomplished without public funds. Not only can Americans now watch the floor debates of both the House and Senate, they can see interest groups, academics and ordinary citizens explore pending issues and offer their advice to policymakers. In addition to covering Congress, C–SPAN points its cameras at presidents and other executive-branch officials whenever possible. It covers state proceedings, including gubernatorial "state-of-the-state" messages, legislative debates, and even voting in the electoral college.

Madam Speaker, C–SPAN offers wonderful programming for everyone with a passion for public affairs. History have learned much by taking field trips to presidential libraries, birthplaces, and elsewhere on the "C–SPAN School Bus." Viewers are again this year traveling the "Road to the White House," with its through coverage of the 2004 campaigns. The "Lyndon Johnson Tapes" offer a fascinating glimpse into a turbulent period. Bibliophiles can explore authors and their works on "Book TV" all weekend long. Anglophiles can revel in British politics with "Prime Minister's Questions" when Parliaments is sitting, and enjoy the pomp of the state opening each November.

C–SPAN has even covered the Canadian and Australian parliaments which, like this Congress, derive their traditions from the "mother of Parliaments" in London.

I'm so proud that C–SPAN's commitment to educating Americans about their government has inspired individuals in my home State of Connecticut. The same historic leap of faith that was taken 25 years ago by C–SPAN, was also taken by State policy-makers and broadcast experts alike in 1999. That year marked the launch of CT–N, also known as the Connecticut Network.

From the beginning, the mission of CT–N has been to connect citizens to State government and public affairs programming. Connecticut Network provides unfiltered television and Web-cast coverage of all three branches of State government. CT–N viewers can watch the legislative sessions of the State Senate and House of Representatives, as well as committee meetings and public hearings, executive branch agency and commission meetings, and selected oral arguments before Connecticut's Supreme Court. The network is

managed and operated by the Connecticut Public Affairs Network, a not-for-profit company founded to educate citizens about State government.

Having served as Senate President Pro Tempore during the years prior to the launch of CT–N, I recall those early discussions about how we could provide television coverage of State Capitol proceedings. It was a daunting task, since at that time only a handful of State legislatures were airing government activities. Yet, no one doubted that such programming would one day exist in Connecticut. CT–N is now available in more than one million households in the State.

What a thrill it is for me to now see CT–N's camera persons walking the halls of the State Capitol when I'm back in the district. They are now part of the Capitol press corps, ready to cover breaking news at a moment's notice.

Why does CT–N's viewership continue to grow every year? It's because CT–N President and CEO Paul Giguere is constantly looking for new opportunities for government programming, and creating unique educational resources. For example, ''Joining the Debate: A Guide to Testifying at Public Hearings'' is a video produced by CT–N; ''CT–N State Civics Toolbox'' is a free teacher resource combining research, discussion, and mock legislature classroom activities with video of actual legislative debates from the Connecticut General Assembly; ''Capitol News Briefings'' are programming segments that follow the story from hearing rooms to assembly chambers; and ''State Agency Close-Ups'' are CT–N video segments that describe each executive branch agency in detail.

Americans are certainly more educated about national public policy issues that affect them thanks to C–SPAN. In Connecticut, CT–N gives citizens the tools and education needed to understand these same issues closer to home.

Madam Speaker, Senator Claude Pepper of Florida introduced legislation providing for broadcasting both houses of Congress in 1944. More than three decades later, in 1977, the House passed legislation to broadcast its proceedings, thus making C–SPAN possible.

The vote on the necessary resolution, sponsored by TRENT LOTT, now a Senator from Mississippi, was 342 to 44, an overwhelming expression of hope that broadcasting would benefit both the American people and the House.

I was not here then, but I bet the results of the last 25 years have exceeded the House's expectations many times over. On behalf of my constituents in Connecticut, and the House, I am proud to offer my congratulations to Brian Lamb and the entire staff of C–SPAN on its 25th anniversary of House broadcast coverage. Thanks to C–SPAN, our democracy is stronger, making America a better place for us all. I have no doubt that, 25 years hence, C–SPAN will have made even greater strides than it has in its first quarter-century. I urge everyone to tune in and watch C–SPAN prove me right.

THOMAS P. ''TIP'' O'NEILL

On many a pleasant Thursday night, his former aides say, House Speaker Thomas P. ''Tip'' O'Neill would slip away to his beloved Cape Code for a weekend of golf. After all, even if the Congress were holding a Friday session, the speaker could tune in to C–SPAN to keep an eye on the floor, and he could phone instructions to his staff on Capitol Hill if he saw something he didn't like.

Years later, former House Speaker Tip O'Neill would call televising the House of Representatives ''one of the best decisions I ever made.'' In 1977, his first year as speaker, the Massachusetts Democrat agreed to put House television on his agenda; by March 1979, the first live, gavel-to-gavel telecast of the House went our by satellite to 3.5 million cable homes. ''Thanks to television, the House of Representatives is now recognized as the dominant branch of Congress,'' wrote Speaker O'Neill in his 1987 autobiography, Man of the House.

However, wary of its impact on the legislative process, Tip O'Neill had not always supported House television. ''We were disgusted with how the major networks covered the Republican and Democratic conventions,'' he wrote. ''If a delegate was picking his nose, that's what you'd see. . . . No wonder so many of us were skittish.''

But after six years of debate on the issue, the new speaker saw it was time to move ahead. So, with the help of Democratic Party leaders, a proposal was crafted that gave the office of the speaker control of the television cameras. ''That,'' he says, ''struck me as a reasonable compromise.'' On October 22, 1977, the House passed a measure permitting full coverage of its sessions—on its own terms and with tight controls—by a vote of 342–44.

After the measure passed, a telecommunications task force headed by Rep. Charlie Rose (D-North Carolina) helped Speaker O'Neill lay down the rules for the telecasts. A $1.6 million system was installed. Cameras would be trained on the speakers at the podium, and would not be allowed to pan the chamber. During 15-minute votes, an electronic vote tally would cover the screen. Proceedings of the legislative body would be covered live, uninterrupted, and ''gavel-to-gavel'' and would be offered to all accredited news organizations. Only C–SPAN, however, committed itself to telecasting the House of Representatives whenever it was in session.

The speaker recalls that some members of the House continued to grumble about the television measure after it passed. ''Many of the members, of course, were skeptical. . . . Today, of course, it's hard to imagine Congress without it, and the results of our broadcasting experience have exceeded my wildest hopes,'' he says.

It may have taken a few years, but House TV gained a loyal following among those members who saw the potential of the unblinking television eye. ''I see a young fellow come on the floor with a blue suit and a red necktie, hair groomed back, and an envelope under his arm,'' the speaker explained, ''and I know that he's going to make a speech and that speech is for home consumption. His office has already notified the local media that he's going to be on and he's going to give a talk.''

The audience for congressional telecasts grew as well. Just five years into its run, the speaker was calling the audience for Congress ''unbelievable.'' One avid viewer was the speaker himself, who said, ''I really enjoy when I come in at night and put it on and see a committee hearing.''

During his eight years of congressional TV coverage, the speaker became a familiar figure to many Americans. People began to recognize the speaker when they saw him in airports or on the street. Appearing in a televised interview with C–SPAN to mark House TV's fifth anniversary in early 1984, Speaker O'Neill said, ''Television is here to stay now. . . . Everywhere I go, people say, 'Well, I saw so-and-so on the show,' or 'I listened to this bill,' or 'What are your views on that?'' He said he believed that coverage of the House had ''whetted the curiosity of America as far as the running of the government is concerned,'' call it ''very informative for the American people.''

Within months, though, a controversy would follow the speaker's rosy assessment. In May 1984, Speaker O'Neill asserted his control over the House cameras, provoking cries of protest from House Republicans and leading to a disruption on the House floor. In the process, the way that television covers the House underwent permanent change.

On May 10, 1984, the speaker ordered House cameras to break with precedent and provide a full view of the empty House chamber during Special Orders speeches. With Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pennsylvania) on the floor, the camera for the first time showed a representative gesturing and talking to a chamber of empty seats.

Minority whip Trent Lott (R-Mississippi), watching in his office, dropped what he was doing and raced to the floor to denounce the surprise camera angle as ''an underhanded, sneaky, politically motivated change.'' The press picked up on the story immediately and gave it the name of ''Camscam''; Washington Post TV critic Tom Shales called it a ''knockabout slugfest'' and wrote that ''the brouhaha over control of the cameras has ignited the House and in the process served to dramatize again the huge presence television has in the political process.''

''Camscam'' came to a head on May 15, when harsh words flew on the House floor between Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Georgia) and Speaker O'Neill. Mr. O'Neill called a Gingrich speech ''the lowest thing I have ever seen in my 32 years in Congress''—a remark that the House parliamentarian ruled out of order. The speaker's words were taken down and the phrase was struck from the official congressional record, the first such rebuke to a House speaker in this century.

In time, ''Camscam'' died down, but today the cameras continue to show the whole chamber during Special Orders, giving audiences a fuller view of the post-legislative business proceedings. Later, in response to an initiative by the Republican leadership, cameras also started showing varied shots of the House members during votes. Slowly, the early restrictions on what the viewing audience could see through television were easing.

Speaker O'Neill, 75, likes to say that his social policies brought many poor people into ''the great American tent of opportunity,'' During his years as speaker, many Americans were brought into the halls of Congress via television. His decision to support televised coverage of the House of Representatives ushered in a new era of government accessibility. House TV went through its growing pains, but its success eventually influenced the Senate to follow suite, voting to let itself be televised in 1986. When future generations remember Tip O'Neill—the man who served the longest consecutive term as speaker—they may well remember him as the man who let Americans see their government at work.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the senior member of that delegation.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

I rise to commemorate this great anniversary. I was elected to Congress in 1976 just as the great Tip O'Neill was

rising to become the Speaker of this great House. And there was a debate that raged in Congress over whether or not television should be allowed into this Chamber, and it was a debate that went on and on behind closed doors catalyzed by Brian Lamb, who had this idea that he could bring the United States House of Representatives to the American people. And of course the younger Members felt that that was a great idea because we had all grown up watching television. But the older Members, they were not quite so sure that that was a great idea, that the cameras would roam around and look for a Member who is nodding off, look for a Member reading a newspaper on the floor. And so this debate continued until a compromise was reached that the cameras would just focus upon the locations where the Members were speaking. And it was an incredible discussion.

But going back that 25 years, it is now clear that C–SPAN has long served the American people by opening the House of Representatives, the Senate, and thousands of congressional hearings and public safety discussions around the U.S. and the globe for the American public to see and to hear. And it is all because of this decision made by Tip O'Neill, Massachusetts' great man of the House, that all of this was made possible.

As we honor Brian Lamb and C–SPAN for 25 years of televised coverage of the House floor proceedings, we must also honor the memory of Tip O'Neill, whose singular decision it was to begin televising House proceedings, bringing the House of Representatives into the television age. Tip took an enormous risk in opening the House floor to the cameras. Television coverage had been debated for years; and many of, as I said, the more senior Members of the House were vehemently against it. The discussions raged in the well of the House for months on end over whether or not it was a good decision. There were those who preferred the status quo and resisted opening the House floor proceedings to television. But one of Tip's first decisions after he assumed the House Chair was to turn on the cameras. Tip intuitively knew it was an idea whose time had come. And when Brian Lamb went to Tip with his idea to take the television feed and send it across the Nation, gavel to gavel, and Tip agreed, neither of them quite knew what they had wrought.

Jack Farrell and his great biography, ''Tip O'Neill and the Democratic Century,'' has Brian Lamb tell his story of his visit with the Speaker: ''I was a nervous wreck. I was shaking.'' He said, ''I don't think to this day that'' Tip ''understood what was going to happen, and I'll never understand why he did what he did. He had nothing to win in the process except a little openness.''

I would say that Tip achieved a world of openness and brought great credit to this institution by allowing the American public to see for the first time what had previously been restricted to those who travel to Washington and come to visit us in the visitors' gallery. Tip let the people all across our country get a chance to see the people's House at work. Why did he do it? I would say it was his instinct kicking in about what was the right thing to do. And we could always trust Tip's instinct. He was right to let C–SPAN in 25 years ago, and today we join in expressing our appreciation for Tip's decision and our appreciation to Brian Lamb and C–SPAN for asking Tip to create this huge revelation which has brought democracy into the homes of every single American as well as people around the world. And I think that much of the revolution that has happened over the last 25 years in the world relates to their ability to see how we create our laws and our country. And Tip O'Neill and Brian Lamb deserve the credit.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just wanted to thank again the dean of the New England delegation and of Massachusetts for his thoughtful comments about the beloved Tip O'Neill and again associate myself with the remarks of the esteemed chairman from Ohio. Indeed, this is a very important event and certainly one where both Mr. Lamb and Mr. O'Neill deserve justified recognition.

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

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

Let me say in closing, again, I think this is a great day, and considering the holiday, and, in fact, my relatives came here under the name O'Ney, I would like to thank also the late Speaker, Tip O'Neill, our current Speaker O'HASTERT and Congressman O'LARSON for joining us today in honoring C–SPAN.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution honoring the service of C–SPAN for the past 25 years.

Since first broadcasting daily floor proceedings of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1979, C–SPAN has fulfilled a great service for the American people. C–SPAN did the extraordinary and unthinkable—it brought the Federal Government into the homes of millions across the country. No longer were the proceedings of the House a mystery—the veil was finally lifted and Americans could now see their Government in action.

C–SPAN has continued to grow with the changing face of technology. In 1986, service was expanded to cover the Senate and beginning in 1997, C–SPAN launched live web coverage of the House and Senate proceedings.

In particular, I would like to salute the creative work of Brian Lamb, founder and CEO, for bringing C–SPAN to life. He is a native Hoosier and hails from Indiana's Fourth Congressional District. Brian still speaks of the small town values he learned while growing up in Indiana and talks of the encouragement he received from family and teachers for having a tremendous impact on his life. He has not forgotten his roots and I thank him for his service to this country and to the Congress.

The vision of C–SPAN was for it to educate the country about the Federal Government and how it works on behalf of all of us. And for a quarter of a century, C–SPAN has connected people and government in a manner that puts the politics aside and focuses on the substantive issues. C–SPAN lives by the maxim that the better informed, the better we are as a society.

I am pleased to support this resolution commending Brian, C–SPAN, and its staff of 275 employees for 25 years of service and education to the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 551.

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. NEY. Madam 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. NEY. Madam 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. Res. 551.

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

There was no objection.

## MYRON V. GEORGE POST OFFICE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3733) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 Huston Street in Altamont, Kansas, as the ''Myron V. George Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3733

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

**SECTION 1. MYRON V. GEORGE POST OFFICE.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 Huston Street in Altamont, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the ''Myron V. George Post Office'' .

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Myron V. George Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), the sponsor of the bill, I rise in support of H.R. 3733 that designates this postal facility in Altamont, Kansas, as the ''Myron V. George Post Office.'' This is a well-deserved honor for Congressman Myron George, who, despite passing away more than 30 years ago, remains one of Kansas's favorite sons to this day.

Congressman George served four terms in the House representing the people of southeast Kansas.

□ 1430

His respected career in the Congress followed his service in the United States Army during World War I, and when he returned safely home from the war, he learned the printing trade on the staff of his father's newspaper, the Altamont Journal. George ultimately became the owner and the publisher of the Edna Sun in Edna, Kansas, and he published that newspaper for 17 years until 1941.

While he still owned the Edna Sun, Myron George became an officer with the Kansas State Highway Commission in 1939 and, as a result of his decade of work with the Commission, he was elected to the first of his four terms to the United States House of Representatives in 1950. During his tenure in the House, Congressman George was known for his modesty and effectiveness. His greatest achievement was using his experience on the Kansas Highway Commission to work with President Dwight Eisenhower to implement the Federal Interstate Highway System for which the Eisenhower administration was famous.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge every Member of the House to support this legislation that honors Congressman Myron George, and I certainly congratulate the gentleman from Kansas for shepherding H.R. 3733 through the committee process. I look forward to hearing his words.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 3733, legislation naming a postal facility in Altamont, Kansas after Myron George. This measure was introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) on January 27, 2004 and unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Reform on February 26, 2004.

Myron Virgil George was born in Kansas in 1900 and attended grade school and high school in Altamont, Kansas. He served in the United States Army for 2 years before he learned the printing trade at the Altamont Journal.

After serving as an officer with the Kansas State Highway Commission for 11 years, Myron George ran for Congress in 1950 in a special election. He served in the United States Congress until 1959. He returned to his home State and engaged in public relations in the transportation and construction fields until his death in 1972.

Madam Speaker, I urge the swift adoption of H.R. 3733.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise as the sponsor of H.R. 3733, a bill to honor the memory of former southeast Kansas Congressman and favored son, Myron George.

First of all, I want to thank the entire Kansas delegation for their cosponsorship and support of this bill. I also want to offer my thanks to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for their efforts.

This proposal has widespread support throughout the Altamont and surrounding communities. I have received letters of support from the Labette County Board of Commissioners, the mayor and city council members of Altamont, as well as the owner of the post office building.

Born at the turn of the century, Congressman George grew up in Altamont, Kansas. He was a World War I veteran, stationed in Panama, and a newspaper publisher. George served as an officer of the local American Legion post, a member of the Disabled American Veterans, and a member of the local Methodist church.

In 1939, Congressman George turned to official public life. For over 10 years, he served on the Kansas State Highway Commission, followed by 8 years in the U.S. House of Representatives. During his time in Congress, his first priority was to provide excellent constituent services. Legislatively, he is best remembered for his continued efforts on behalf of transportation issues. He worked with another great Kansan, President Eisenhower, to develop and implement the Federal Interstate Highway System.

Congressman George also worked towards securing local funds for water projects. He helped establish an Army ROTC unit at Kansas State Teachers College, and he fought for continued operation of the Kansas Ordnance Plant in Parsons.

In 1959, Congressman George returned to southeast Kansas where he lived until his death in 1972.

Madam Speaker, renaming the Altamont Post Office in honor of Congressman George is a fitting reminder of his role and dedication to his community and to all Kansans. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I urge that all Members support the passage of H.R. 3733.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3733.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LUIS A. FERRÉ

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 433) honoring the life and legacy of Luis A. Ferré.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 433

Whereas Luis A. Ferré was born in Ponce, Puerto Rico, on February 17, 1904, soon after Spain ceded control of Puerto Rico to the United States in 1898;

Whereas in 1917, when Luis Ferré was 13 years old, the people of Puerto Rico were granted United States citizenship;

Whereas Luis Ferré's respect for the United States was fostered by his years as a college student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Massachusetts;

Whereas Luis Ferré returned to Puerto Rico with a degree in engineering and a firm belief in Puerto Rican statehood;

Whereas Luis Ferré built his father's business, Puerto Rico Iron Works, into a hugely successful industrial enterprise;

Whereas Luis Ferré, who entered politics at a propitious time in the island's history, was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention in 1951 and was elected to the Puerto Rican House of Representatives in 1953;

Whereas Luis Ferré saw the opportunity to advocate Puerto Rican statehood in 1967, the year of the first political status plebiscite on the island;

Whereas, although Puerto Rico remained a commonwealth after the 1967 plebiscite, Luis Ferré utilized the plebiscite to mobilize statehood forces and to establish a new political entity, the New Progressive Party;

Whereas in 1968 Luis Ferré ran for Governor of Puerto Rico as the New Progressive Party candidate and won a close race;

Whereas Luis Ferré served as Governor for one term, from 1969 to 1973;

Whereas, as Governor, Luis Ferré ordered the liberation of all political prisoners incarcerated in Puerto Rican prisons as an act of national reconciliation;

Whereas when Luis Ferré was elected Governor he launched an effort to address what he called ''the inequalities of Puerto Rican society'', with initiatives to grant property titles to people living on public lands and to build multiple housing structures in rural and urban areas of Puerto Rico to provide homes for low-income families;

Whereas, during his term as Governor, Luis Ferré signed into law several pieces of social legislation that contributed to the betterment of Puerto Rican workers, including pay increases for teachers and policemen as well as other public employees and ''Christmas bonuses'', whereby workers received a check for at least 4 percent of their annual salary during the holiday season;

Whereas, as Governor, Luis Ferré appointed the first woman to a cabinet-level position, selecting Julita Rivera de Vicenty as Secretary of Labor of Puerto Rico;

Whereas Luis Ferré made great contributions to Puerto Rican cultural life, founding the Ponce Museum of Arts and giving scholarships to artists to further their studies in disciplines such as painting, visual arts, and music;

Whereas, throughout his life over the past century, Luis Ferré became an honored elder statesman and philanthropist;

Whereas Luis Ferré is one of four Puerto Ricans who have received the Presidential Medal of Freedom; and

Whereas Luis Ferré passed away on October 21, 2003, at the age of 99: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Luis A. Ferré for his outstanding political leadership, business savvy, advocacy for social justice, and great love and support of the arts; and

(2) expresses condolences on his passing to his wife, Tiody de Jesus, and his two children, Antonio Luis and Rosario, and grandchildren.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan. (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 433 honors Luis A. Ferré, perhaps the greatest political figure in Puerto Rico during the last half century. Luis Ferré passed away in San Juan at the age of 99 on October 21, 2003, and this resolution recognizes his lifelong devotion to the United States, and to social justice in his native Puerto Rico.

Luis Ferré spent his life as a successful businessman and a human rights advocate for people on the small Caribbean island. He was elected to terms as Governor and to Representative in Puerto Rico.

Madam Speaker, Luis Ferré loved the United States and his greatest hope was to see his native Puerto Rico become an American State. In 1917, at the age of 13 years old, Ferré and the Puerto Rican population were granted United States citizenship. In the year of 2000, Ferré once recounted that he could not distinctly remember the event but, he said, ''Ever since I have been very proud of that day. I feel it is a great privilege and a great honor to be a citizen of the greatest republic that we have had in the history of the world.''

In 1951, Ferré was elected delegate to the Puerto Rican Constitutional Convention and he was able to directly contribute to the island becoming an official United States Commonwealth in 1952.

In 1968, Ferré was elected Governor and he continued to work towards Puerto Rican Statehood. He remained active in politics up to his death, most notably as the chairman of the Republican Party in Puerto Rico.

To recognize Luis Ferré's life of public service, former President George H.W. Bush awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest government award a civilian can receive, in 1991. Ferré is one of four Puerto Ricans to ever receive this Presidential honor.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his efforts to bring House Resolution 433 to the floor today, and I urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the term ''renaissance man'' is tossed around far too casually because people do not truly understand what it means. The artist and scholars in the Italian Renaissance venerated people who were accomplished in many different fields. Present diversification rather than specialization, was the ideal of the time. As a term of admiration, ''renaissance man'' has few peers. It is a term that was often used to refer to Luis A. Ferré, the former Governor of Puerto Rico, who passed away in October of 2003.

Mr. Ferré, in addition to being the Governor, was a successful businessman and a philanthropist and engineer, a classically trained musician, a political pioneer, and a patron of the arts: a renaissance man indeed.

Luis A. Ferré was born in Ponce, Puerto Rico on February 17, 1904, the son of an engineer of French descent. After spending his early childhood in Ponce, he attended high school in Morristown, New Jersey, before enrolling at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he received degrees in mechanical engineering and electrical engineering. In addition, he studied at the New England Conservatory of Music where he became an accomplished classical pianist.

Mr. Ferré is perhaps best remembered as an advocate for Puerto Rico statehood. After running for Governor twice on the ticket of the Republican Statehood Party, he formed his own party, the New Progressive Party, on whose ticket he was elected Governor of Puerto Rico in 1968. He served for one term, from 1969 to 1973, during which time he established his legacy of positive progress for Puerto Rico. He granted property titles to those living on public lands, built housing for low-income families, and made a positive step forward for gender equality in Puerto Rico by appointing the Commonwealth's first female Cabinet Secretary.

After leaving office, Mr. Ferré continued his advocacy of Puerto Rican statehood. He was passionately dedicated to the principle that not only should Puerto Rico be made more fully a part of the United States, but the United States should be aware of how important Puerto Rico was to it. During one of his many appearances before Congress, Mr. Ferré reminded the Members of how much Puerto Rico is engrained in the American experience. ''Not only are Puerto Ricans citizens by birth,'' Mr. Ferré said, ''but one would be hard-pressed to find a Puerto Rican without a sister in New York, a son in Chicago, a cousin in Orlando, or a daughter in Honolulu or Oklahoma City.'' A statement such as this from a man born just 6 years after Puerto Rico was taken from Spain as a prize of war shows just how far Puerto Rico came in his lifetime.

Mr. Ferré's dedication to the arts defined him almost as much as his political accomplishments. Realizing that culture was as important to the future of Puerto Rico as prosperity, he founded and endowed the Ponce Museum of Art and the city library in Ponce. He saved the local newspaper from folding, and El Nuevo Dia, now based in San Juan, is the island's biggest newspaper.

Luis A. Ferré, one of the finest and most prominent Puerto Ricans of the past century, liked to describe himself as a revolutionary in his ideas, liberal in his objectives, and conservative in his methods. He was a friend to Presidents and a titan to Puerto Rican politics. He was an honorable protector of Puerto Rico's past and its future. And, with the condolences of the House, he

is deserving and worthy of this resolution in his honor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I thank both Members for bringing this resolution to the floor.

When I introduced this resolution, I did it with the full understanding that we would be honoring the legacy of Luis A. Ferré, a true Puerto Rican visionary who wanted so much to continue to be part of this great Nation of ours. As many of my colleagues know, Luis lived 99-plus years and, during that time, he dedicated most of his life to public service. We usually do not like to talk about people's personal financial situations, but it is no secret that he was an extremely wealthy man who could have very easily just sat back and enjoyed spending money and living the life of someone who was very well off. Instead, he chose both to move forward what he felt was his vision of what the Puerto Rican society should look like and be like and act like and, at the same time, his deep belief to make Puerto Rico the 51st State of the Union. In fact, when he started this movement, it probably would have been the 48th or the 49th or the 50th State of the Union. He did that with the full understanding that the Puerto Rican community had a lot to offer to the United States and that the United States had a lot to offer through statehood to Puerto Rico.

At the same time that Luis pushed for statehood and advocated for what he believed was the proper route for Puerto Rico to take, he went about building the island's economy and building the island's cultural institutions. Museums, concert halls, television work and radio work all were part of his vision, and he pushed this to the very, very end of his life.

Every time he would visit Congress or come to Washington, he would visit my office. I was always taken by the fact that this man was such a gentleman, such a soft-spoken yet strong believer in everything that he stood for.

One of the things that he stood for was his belief that the poor had to have a better way in Puerto Rico. In fact, he gets credit for building the statehood movement amongst the poor by making sure that he expressed to them that statehood was not for the wealthy, but that statehood was for the poor. Before he came along, it was always seen as simply a Republican, wealthy kind of a situation.

□ 1445

He took it and brought it to everybody. I think it is important to note that in Puerto Rico the political structure is based on Commonwealth, statehood, or independence. But in those parties there are people who associate nationally with either the Republican or the Democratic Party. Within the statehood party there are people who are Democrats, there are people who are Republicans. It will please my colleagues to know that he was a staunch Republican who was very close to the Bush family and very close to Republican leaders throughout the country. It is for that reason that he received so many accolades from our government. In fact, in 1991, former President George H.W. Bush awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

I remember once I was talking, and I will be very brief, but I was talking to a member of the Independence Party, the people who are totally opposed to statehood. And I think the greatest compliment that you hear for someone like Luis Ferré came from this member of the Independence Party. We were talking about him and he said, ''This man is a true patriot.'' I said, ''Wait a minute. You are calling a person who pushes statehood a patriot and yet you are for independence?'' He said, ''Yes. He is a patriot because everything Luis Ferré has ever done is in Puerto Rico's best interest and mine. And that is what signifies who is a patriot and who is not.'' And I will always remember that there is no greater tribute from someone who is totally opposed to your philosophy to say that you are for the good of the people.

He never saw his dream come true of Puerto Rico becoming the 51st State. But he did see Puerto Rico grow from a poor economy to a vibrant economy, from an island considered by many to be somewhere in the Caribbean to an island that became very much a part of the American family, and an island that became very much a part of the Caribbean family.

He is truly one of the greatest Puerto Ricans and certainly one of the greatest Americans to have ever lived. And he will be missed. I will miss him as a friend, I will miss him for the gentleman that he was, I will miss him as a leader. And today we honor that legacy through this resolution.

I want to thank all of our colleagues for honoring the life and legacy of Luis A. Ferré.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 433, honoring the life and legacy of Luis A. Ferré. Luis A. Ferré was a crucial figure in the history of Puerto Rico who led a life of service to his people. He was an accomplished businessman, skilled politician, and compassionate philanthropist.

Born on February 17, 1904, in Ponce, PR, he went on to study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where he earned a degree in engineering. Upon his return to Puerto Rico, he worked in his father's business, Puerto Rico Iron Works, and later became involved in politics as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, a member of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, and, in 1968, was elected Governor.

Ferré was a believer in Puerto Rican statehood, and his convictions led him to create the New Progressive Party, which to this day remains one of the leading political parties in Puerto Rico.

He dedicated his life to serving the people of Puerto Rico and working to improve their lives and futures. During his term as Governor, he created multiple government agencies and public projects to enhance the quality of life of Puerto Ricans, and launched several housing and labor initiatives of great importance.

In addition to his political achievements, Luis A. Ferré is also remembered in Puerto Rico as a great philanthropist and advocate of Puerto Rican culture. Among his biggest contributions to Puerto Rico's cultural life were the Ponce Museum of Arts, which began with a donation from his personal collection, scholarship programs for art and music students, and the largest-circulation newspaper in Puerto Rico.

Ferré's contributions to the development of Puerto Rico and the improvement of its society will be forever remembered and appreciated. Regrdless of one's position on the issue of Puerto Rico's status, Ferré was an able statesman who dedicated his life to his beloved island.

This is why today I encourage you to support this resolution to honor the life of this respected and revered Puerto Rican. I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. SERRANO, for introducing this measure. I also have introduced a bill to immortalize Ferré, H.R. 3742, which would designate the United States Courthouse and Post Office Building located at 93 Antocha Street in Ferré's hometown of Ponce as the Luis A. Ferré United States Courthouse and Post Office Building. It is my hope that we can further remember the legacy of Ferré by bringing this bill up at a later date.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in my capacity as the ranking Democrat of the Resources Committee to join in honoring Luis A. Ferré.

In 1967, a young man named Luis Ferré set out an agenda for his home island which has transformed the political landscape of Puerto Rico. The modern day pro-Puerto Rico statehood movement began with Luis Ferré and his efforts in forming the New Progressive Party.

Today we take the opportunity to honor the life on Don Luis Ferré, a veneration bestowed by the people of Puerto Rico.

Don Luis died at the age of 99. Having been an engineer, businessman, politician, pianist, and philanthropist, it is no wonder that he has been described as a renaissance man.

Born shortly after the United States gained possession of Puerto Rico from Spain, he was raised both in Puerto Rico and the United States mainland. After receiving his high school degree in Morristown, NJ, he pursued undergraduate studies in engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Before leaving MIT, Don Luis would earn a master's degree in electrical engineering. He returned to Puerto Rico thereafter to help build up the family business.

In 1937, Don Luis founded the Ponce Public Library. His love for education and the arts continued to mark major accomplishments in

his life when in 1950 he established a foundation in his own name. The Luis A. Ferré Foundation would result in the creation of the Ponce Museum of Art, regarded as a world-class repository for the classics and for Puerto Rican culture.

In 1967, following a political status plebiscite where the choice of ''statehood'' received 39 percent of votes cast, Don Luis, an ardent and impassioned believer in Puerto Rico becoming the fifty-first State of the Union, established the New Progressive Party.

The following year, running on a platform promoting statehood, Don Luis was elected Governor of Puerto Rico.

After serving one-term, Don Luis worked to strengthen his party and Puerto Rico. He continued to advocate statehood and promoted American democracy in the region. His words and actions inspired many Puerto Rican leaders of today. Former Governor Pedro Rosello and our former colleague Carlos Romero-Barcelo are but two of the notables who benefited from the path which Don Luis blazed.

In 1991, his life's work, as a visionary and public servant, was awarded with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Don Luis Ferré was a stateman in the highest regard. His ideas and leadership were respected by all political parties and their leaders. His passing brought about mourning throughout Puerto Rico and for the tens of thousands of Puerto Ricans living in the United States mainland.

Don Luis Ferré was a lover of American democracy. He was a believer in making lives better, especially those in those in his home of Puerto Rico. In my view, Congress has an obligation to provide an opportunity for the 3.9 million people of Puerto Rico to achieve Don Luis's dream of membership in our Union if they so desire it.

It is an honor for me to honor him.

I encourage all my colleagues to support H. Res. 433, and I thank my colleague Mr. SERRANO for his effort to have this considered on the floor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 433, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 433.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 87) honoring the life and legacy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and recognizing his contributions on the anniversary of the date of his birth.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 87

Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was born in Hyde Park, New York, on January 30, 1882;

Whereas his commitment to public service followed the example of his fifth cousin, the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt;

Whereas sixty years ago, President Roosevelt became the only President of the United States elected to a fourth term in office;

Whereas President Roosevelt fulfilled his promise to lead the Nation through the Great Depression by creating a series of New Deal programs that fundamentally changed the role of Government;

Whereas President Roosevelt's leadership was instrumental in extending freedom and democracy around the globe and uniting the world confronted by tyranny and aggression;

Whereas President Roosevelt unified and mobilized the American effort after the bombing of Pearl Harbor and World War II, encouraging patriotism and volunteerism;

Whereas through his war time leadership, President Roosevelt directed the Government into the most productive partnership with private enterprise in the Nation's history by appointing top businessmen to run the production agencies, exempting business from antitrust laws, allowing business to write off the full cost of investments, and guaranteeing a substantial profit;

Whereas as a result of his leadership, the United States was outproducing all the Axis and the Allied powers combined, contributing nearly 300,000 planes, 100,000 tanks, 2 million trucks, and 87,000 warships to the Allied cause;

Whereas 2004 is the 60th anniversary of D-Day, which commemorates the largest air, land, and sea operation undertaken before or since June 6, 1944;

Whereas in the spring of 2004, the National World War II Memorial will be dedicated in Washington, DC, to encourage Americans to celebrate and remember the contributions of President Roosevelt and the courageous men and women which were critical to the American war effort at home and American military successes overseas;

Whereas President Roosevelt supported the effort to find a cure for infantile paralysis (polio), by which he had been paralyzed in 1921; in 1938, President Roosevelt founded the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, a national organization which raised funds to find a cure for polio; the following year, comedian Eddie Cantor asked the Nation to mail dimes to the White House to help the Foundation, and in one month, the White House received 2.5 million dimes; Cantor declared it ''A March of Dimes'' and, in 1979, the name became the lasting moniker for the Foundation;

Whereas President Roosevelt established the polio foundation hospital at Warm Springs, Georgia, for the treatment of polio patients, which had a profound impact on scores of young Americans;

Whereas in a broadcast launching the annual March of Dimes Campaign, President Harry S. Truman declared ''The fight to conquer infantile paralysis is an unfinished task of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It must and shall be carried to complete victory.''; thanks to President Roosevelt and the March of Dimes, polio is largely now a thing of the past in America and worldwide eradication of polio is expected by 2005;

Whereas Americans who encountered and conquered polio have benefited from the March of Dimes and from President Roosevelt's example of courage;

Whereas Eleanor Roosevelt more than fulfilled her traditional duties as First Lady;

Whereas she expanded the role, being voted the most admired woman in America and even called ''the First Lady of the Western World'' for her work on behalf of civil rights, women's rights, and human rights; she carried on the beliefs and ideals of her husband, serving as the foremost spokesperson for human rights around the world as the first chairperson of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights;

Whereas President Roosevelt is loved and admired by millions of Americans and by countless others around the world; and

Whereas a grateful Nation and world are better off because of President Roosevelt's inimitable leadership: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Congress, on behalf of the American people, honors the life and legacy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and recognizes his contributions on the anniversary of the date of his birth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam 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.J. Res. 87.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 87 sponsored by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

This resolution offers the House a chance to remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt's leadership over 120 years after his birth.

Madam Speaker, President Roosevelt who, of course, was known very affectionately around the world as FDR, skillfully guided our great Nation through the Great Depression and World War II during four terms in the White House.

When he first took office in 1933 FDR pushed through Congress legislation designed to stimulate the inactive American economy. FDR called these measures a New Deal for the American people.

Some have suggested that the New Deal jump-started the economy by stabilizing prices and triggering employers to hire in America work to emerge from the Depression.

Madam Speaker, President Roosevelt also mobilized the American spirit at home and energized the developing military forces abroad following the bombing of Pearl Harbor. His grace during World War II certainly encouraged patriotism, sacrifice from Americans everywhere, which helped the United States prevail in the massive global conflict that he was not able to see through.

President Roosevelt passed away as a result of cerebral hemorrhage just weeks after beginning his fourth term, on April 12, 1945. In large part because of President Roosevelt's vigilance the United States and the allies went on to defeat the Nazis in Europe and force the Japanese to surrender in the Pacific Theater later that year.

In a message to Congress in June of 1934, FDR stated that among the top priorities of his administration would be the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first. The President stated that the security of the home and the security of livelihood constitutes a right that belongs to every individual. Securing America's future through frightening times was perhaps FDR's greatest legacy. And for that reason and many others, the House honors him today.

Madam Speaker, just as the Resolved clause of the resolution states, I urge the Congress to honor the life and legacy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I commend the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for introducing House Joint Resolution 87 that honors one of America's most legendary leaders in history.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I will reserve my remarks for the RECORD and yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my colleague and cousin.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my cousin, for introducing this resolution. And I appreciate the bipartisan support of the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) who is presiding today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), all of whom joined in becoming original cosponsors of the measure.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was bigger than life when I was a youngster, and properly so, because he did such a wonderful job in leading America out of the worst Depression in our history and leading the United States toward victory against the Japanese and the Germans. Unfortunately, he died on April 12, 1945, and Missouri's Harry Truman, as you know, the Vice President, became President on that day.

We all know his legacy as a leader, a political leader, a wartime leader, and one who so many people looked up to for so long, the only President elected to four terms as President of the United States.

Let me touch on another subject as to why Franklin Delano Roosevelt is a true American hero. Should you come to my office in the Rayburn Building you will see in a prominent place a portrait, a signed portrait by the artist of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the unfinished portrait that was being made when he collapsed and died at his cabin known as the Little White House at Warm Springs, Georgia. Friends were present at the time when he was stricken and died within a few hours.

President Roosevelt's life and legacy has played a meaningful role in so many lives of untold citizens, far more than as President of the United States in his political leadership or as his world leadership, but it played a social role to those who contracted polio at a young age. And most people who have been so stricken were of a young age.

President Roosevelt established the March of Dimes in 1938 which caused Americans all across the country to send dimes to the White House or create their own March of Dimes fund. I remember very well being a Boy Scout, collecting the dimes on my main street in Lexington, Missouri, for the March of Dimes established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

And he established the foundation at Warm Springs, Georgia, not too far from Columbus. This was an old resort and he changed it into the most modern hospital for the treatment of those who had polio. I have personal experience knowing of that. Warm Springs, Georgia became the mecca for the research, for the treatment, and for surgery involving those who had polio for so very, very long. And the March of Dimes that he created helped establish research funding that could, and, fortunately it did, for all intents and purposes, research that found a cure or a prevention, I should say, to polio.

So, many young people, and I have had the opportunity to know them, created lives that were meaningful which otherwise would not have been possible, thanks to the Warm Springs Foundation established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is rather interesting, he called the patients down there ''my kids.'' And as many Thanksgivings as he possibly could, he would go down and have Thanksgiving dinner with his kids. And that tradition lasted well past his passing from the scene.

The March of Dimes, the foundation at Warm Springs, Georgia, all of that enables others to participate in public life, to take their place as meaningful, hardworking citizens of the United States. But for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that would not have happened. So it is not just during the Depression that he did such a masterful job in pulling this country out, it was not just the war effort until he passed away in April of 1945, but his contribution to treating and to helping find the cure for the prevention of polio, that is what makes Franklin Delano Roosevelt such an outstanding person in the history of our country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN.)

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) who has been so gracious to me on so many occasions for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, first let me thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for introducing this resolution honoring President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is important for Members of this House to not only remember but to acknowledge his many accomplishments and his unique place in our history. The vast majority of Presidential scholars consider FDR to be one of our country's greatest Presidents. As we all know, FDR assumed the Presidency as this Nation confronted the Great Depression. His inspirational words of hope helped Americans get through some of the most difficult economic challenges in our history, and his bold leadership and creative policies ultimately led us out of the Great Depression.

□ 1500

He showed us then, and I think we should all remember this now, that government can be a force for good. It can be an instrument to empower and to help people.

For example, Social Security is one of FDR's greatest legacies. Today, Social Security provides half the income of 60 percent of our senior citizens. It is a program that keeps countless seniors from falling into poverty, the kind of devastating poverty that plagued so many before FDR's efforts. As we honor Franklin Delano Roosevelt's efforts today, we must recommit ourselves to protecting and strengthening Social Security. It can be there for our children and our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren.

After America was attacked at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, FDR and the Greatest Generation rose to the defense of our country by fighting against the Axis Powers. Millions of men and women were mobilized for our war effort.

These Americans came from small towns, large cities, regardless of race or class. They courageously defended our freedom. They sacrificed much, and our country's eternally grateful for their service.

It is particularly fitting that we honor FDR now because 2004 is the 60th anniversary of D-Day. In honoring FDR, we honor the young soldiers who stormed the beaches of France and turned the tide of World War II.

This is also the year that we will dedicate the World War II memorial on the Washington Mall.

Madam Speaker, I attend veterans events in my district all the time, and never is there a time when a World War II veteran does not come up to me and tell me how honored he was to serve under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was an extraordinary Commander in Chief.

Following FDR's death on April 12, 1945, plans were formulated to honor FDR on the dime. The chief proponent of placing FDR's likeness on the dime was then-U.S. Representative Clyde Doyle of California; and Madam Speaker, at this point, I will insert the text of a letter written by Representative DOYLE to the U.S. Mint in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

MAY 3, 1945.

Re To have the likeness of our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt placed on the dime.

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
*Department of the Treasury,*
*Washington, DC.*

MY DEAR FRIEND: A few days ago I received from you in compliance with my request the listing of the relative place in our currency circulation of the first three coins. I note the dime is No. 3. Thank you for this information.

As we stated in asking you therefor, I had in mind that it would be proper to have the likeness of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, placed on the dime. I say ''proper'' for the following reasons, amongst others: First. The dime was made famous over the world because of the triumph by our great beloved President of great spirits, heart, mind, and soul over physical infirmities and handicaps. Second. It was made famous over the world because of the March of Dimes which was sponsored by him in order that the terrible disease of infantile paralysis might be eliminated in the experience of all mankind. The millions of dollars received has actually achieved a great deal in this worthy objective. Third. Other coins of our great Nation have had the likenesses of our great Presidents and citizens placed upon them. Fourth. The circulation of the dime, while No. 3 now in our Nation, is so rapidly increasing that it has become almost the most popular coin in business. Fifth. The dime has become a piece of money for which the average American has real affection because of the identity thereof with the March of Dimes.

The other most commonly used coins each have the head of a great American past President, to wit: The penny, Abraham Lincoln; the nickel, Thomas Jefferson; the quarter, George Washington. It would be very appropriate to have the replica of this great American on one side of the time and the replica of the Goddess of Liberty on the other side.

I do not purpose to offer a bill on the floor of the House in this regard, because I anticipate that a simpler and more efficient process of doing this timely act would be by your Department deciding so to do. If I am in error in this important thought, I shall appreciate your advising in the premise.

I will say, from the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent, there come frequent and very large numbers of requests that this development in honor of this great American take place as promptly as possible.

If there is any reason why this cannot be done by you, kindly call my attention thereto by reply mail.

I have the honor to be,

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
*Member of Congress.*

---

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
*Department of the Treasury,*
*Washington, DC.*

Put a diamond on every dime.

MY DEAR FRIEND: You were good enough on May 1 to answer my inquiry of a few days before with reference to the circulation of the dime and other American coins. Thank you for the information.

On May 3 I briefly wrote you on the subject of my earlier phone communication to you. I see in my letter of May 3 that I did not there include a sixth item, which I had intended to do. So I do it now, and urge this sixth point to your attention as to why the dime should have placed on one side thereof, the likeness of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is as follows:

Sixth. A diamond on every dime. If this statement seems at all odd at first glance, I hope that upon reflection it will occur to you that it is most significant and indicative of the fact that the American people, by and large, thought of him in his lifetime and always will, as a genuine diamond. Genuine diamonds being what they are in fact and in the minds of people, I submit the phrase I am using as psychological strength and reason for putting into effect this suggestion.

Shortly after the death of our great leader, I had intended to file a bill to effectuate the purpose of my suggestion to you, but feeling it was a matter which should logically be put into effect by our agreements between the proper Government officials, rather than by congressional legislation; and that it should be put into effect long before congressional action might be concluded, I am going to make remarks and put them in the Congressional Record in the next day or two.

Another suggestion I have is that if you do put the likeness of this diamond of democracy on the dime, then there should be nationwide—yes, worldwide recognition of your doing so. It might be that an extra March of Dimes campaign be conducted to raise additional money for the infantile-paralysis program, or conduct other or additional appropriate national and even world recognition thereof.

I have the honor to be

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, as many people know, there is an effort underway by some of our colleagues to diminish FDR's legacy by taking his profile off the dime and replacing it with President Ronald Reagan's profile. I am not opposed to honoring President Reagan, who served our country with great distinction, but why in order to honor President Reagan must we dishonor President Roosevelt?

I would like to explain to my colleagues the reasons why FDR is on the dime. Having been paralyzed by infantile paralysis, polio, FDR was a longtime supporter of efforts to eradicate the disease. In 1938, he founded the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, a national organization which raised funds to find a cure for polio.

The following year, comedian Eddie Cantor asked the Nation to mail dimes to the White House to help the foundation; and in one month, the White House received $85,000 in dimes. Cantor declared it a March of Dimes, and the name became the lasting moniker for the foundation.

The new FDR dime was issued on January 30, 1946, the date that would have been FDR's 64th birthday. In a broadcast kicking off the annual March of Dimes campaign on the same day, President Harry S. Truman declared: ''The fight to conquer infantile paralysis is an unfinished task of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It must and shall be carried to complete victory.''

Madam Speaker, at this point, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the March of Dimes statement against removing FDR's profile from the dime.

MARCH OF DIMES STRONGLY OPPOSES REMOVAL OF FDR FROM THE DIME

The profile of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was placed on the dime in 1946 to memorialize his 4 term Presidency, his fight to find a vaccine to prevent polio, and the volunteer movement epitomized by the March of Dimes. For all these reasons, the March of Dimes strongly opposes efforts to remove FDR from the dime.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt dime commemorates a national movement that resulted in the eradication of polio from the United States and in the near future from the entire world. The efforts funded through the ''March of Dimes'' campaign initiated by Roosevelt provided care for the victims of polio while aggressively working to develop vaccines against it. This represented one of the first large-scale, nationwide biomedical initiatives, led by a charitable organization. It also helped make the volunteer movement an integral part of the fabric of American life.

In January 1938, alarmed by decades of worsening polio epidemics and the terrible toll the virus was taking on America's young, President Roosevelt established the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The National Foundation emphasized the nationwide significance and non-partisan character of the polio crusade. FDR believed that people could solve any problem if they worked together. Comedian Eddie Cantor coined the phrase ''March of Dimes'' (playing on the popular newsreel feature ''The March of Time''), appealing to radio listeners all over the country to send their dimes directly to the White House. The campaign proved to be hugely successful with over 2.5 million dimes sent to the White House the first year. The National Foundation officially changed its name to the March of Dimes in 1979.

The FDR dime not only commemorates his presidency, but represents the American spirit of working together to help one another. The coin is symbolic of the struggle to end polio through the ''March of Dimes'' campaign and the worldwide eradication of polio is expected in 2005. The dime is a vehicle in which to explain what the volunteer spirit in America means, it would be a shame to lose that.

In response to the Reagan dime bill, I introduced H. Con. Res. 343, which expresses Congress's support for the FDR

dime. It currently has 130 cosponsors. In fact, Nancy Reagan supports leaving FDR on the dime. Mrs. Reagan said, ''While I can understand the intentions of those seeking to place my husband's face on the dime, I do not support this proposal, and I am certain Ronnie would not. When our country chooses to honor a great President such as FDR by placing his likeness on our currency, it would be wrong to replace him with another. It is my hope that this proposed legislation will be withdrawn.''

I, at this point, would insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Gainesville Times on this issue.

HONOR REAGAN? FINE. DISHONOR ROOSEVELT? NO.

The latest lunacy to emanate from Congress needs to stop on a dime: literally.

Rep. Mark Souder, a Republican from Indiana, is miffed about the miniseries now airing on Showtime, a premium cable channel operated by CBS, on former President Ronald Reagan and his wife, Nancy. The miniseries portrays Reagan, who suffers from Alzheimer's, as a doddering, rather pathetic figure and his wife as a calculating, domineering manipulator.

Therefore, according to Souder's logic, Reagan should replace former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the dime.

Souder and other conservatives, inside and outside Congress, were outraged when CBS announced earlier this fall that it would air ''The Reagans'' on network TV. CBS backed off last month and sent the miniseries to Showtime, where it plays to much smaller audiences. That hardly mollified Souder and some of his colleagues in the House.

''It's what precipitated me introducing the bill . . . and why it was a lot easier to get a lot of support,'' Souder said of the miniseries, which he termed ''vile'' in a letter to colleagues in support of his proposal.

Souder claims to have the support of 88 other House Republicans for his ridiculous idea. More than a dozen of them are from California, where the Reagans make their home and where Reagan is a former governor.

In his effort to rewrite history and dishonor Roosevelt, Souder trots out the ''L'' word in what's becoming a tiresome exercise in partisan politics.

''I believe (Reagan) represents conservative values as we would see them implemented through a president better than anybody else we've had in American history,'' Souder said. ''He, to conservatives, represents kind of the reverse of FDR, who is kind of the liberal icon. Ronald Reagan is the conservative icon.''

We ''kind of'' miss Souder's point and why the obscure congressman believes it's proper to replace Roosevelt on the coin.

The presidencies of Roosevelt and Reagan occurred nearly 50 years apart under circumstances that were quite different.

While Reagan helped restore some resolve to American foreign policy in the aftermath of the caution that resulted from the disastrous Vietnam War and gets credit for cracking the facade of communism, Roosevelt governed in much more dire and challenging times.

In 1933, FDR inherited a nation that was reeling from the Great Depression, which began four years earlier when the stock market crashed and set into motion the most cataclysmic economic emergency in the nation's history. From Wall Street to Main Street, panic reigned. Tens of millions of Americans watched their savings, jobs and fortunes vanish.

Roosevelt's innovative employment and economic programs, and the sweeping changes that guaranteed the financial future of older Americans with the creation of Social Security, lifted the nation out of the Depression's nightmare.

During World War II, Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill turned back the horror of Nazi Germany in North Africa and Europe and the brutal occupation of most of Asia by the Japanese in leading history's greatest and most successful coalition in the name of freedom.

While Roosevelt and Churchill were hesitant to partner with Soviet leader Josef Stalin and shortsightedly criticized for doing so, they pragmatically understood the war against Hitler could not be won without assisting the communists.

Roosevelt an icon? How else to describe a president so popular and successful he was elected to four terms as president?

We suspect that many of the Indiana voters represented by Souder were helped to no small degree by the policies that Roosevelt engineered until his death in 1945. Many of them still are beneficiaries of Roosevelt's work.

Reagan deserves an important place in history. And he has won recognition for his achievements in many ways. Ronald Reagan National Airport and the building that houses the Justice Department are named for the former president, as well as countless schools, streets, roads and bridges across America.

We respect the conservatism that Reagan personifies and the conservative values that Souder desires so passionately to honor. But removing Roosevelt from the dime is an illogical and disrespectful way to do so.

Roosevelt and Reagan both were great men and leaders. Few rise to the office of the president without the extraordinary qualities that both possessed.

We would urge Souder and his colleagues to find a less partisan and emotionally charged way to honor the accomplishments of Ronald Reagan. He deserves better than the outlandish scheme that Souder and his co-sponsors of the bill offer.

Mr. Speaker, FDR was a true liberal. He was a believer in dynamic and efficient government. He was not afraid to use government to lift people out of poverty or to help our children, our seniors, our farmers, our veterans, the unemployed, or those who have been forgotten by society.

In his second inaugural address, he said: ''The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.''

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues in honoring FDR. He was a wonderful President, and our Nation and our world is better for his service.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have no further speakers at this time and I support the adoption of House Joint Resolution 87.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would like to, if I may, bring up a recollection. When I was a teenager, I had the opportunity to go to the little White House at Warms Spring, Georgia, and there displayed is a copy of the undelivered address, now infamous undelivered speech, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was to give on the following day, April 13, by radio, Thomas Jefferson's birthday.

Remember, those were very difficult times. We were involved in the Second World War, and it was a very hard time for our country; but I will never forget writing that speech down, and I copied it verbatim on a tablet with pencil, the final words of that undelivered address. The final words, ''Let us move forward, with strong and active faith,'' and I think those words would be well-emblazoned on what we say and what we do today. He added that the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

So let us take a page not just from his life but take a page from that undelivered address, apply it to the challenges, and we have challenges of today, and move forward with strong and active faith.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his eloquent recollections.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.J. Res. 87, which commemorates the contributions of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the anniversary of his birth.

As this legislation so eloquently states, FDR's leadership ''was instrumental in extending freedom and democracy around the globe, and uniting the world confronted by tyranny and aggression.''

Furthermore, he led the United States out of the Great Depression by initiating programs that provided employment and social services to the millions of people whose hopes had been dashed by joblessness and severe economic conditions nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular connection to FDR's legacy: As a young man living in war-torn Europe, I wrote an essay about his economic policies that helped secure a scholarship to the University of Washington. I went on to earn a Ph.D. in economics and to teach the subject at university level for 30 years. And when I later was honored with the opportunity to become a Member of Congress, I was able to join the House International Relations Committee to help build on the alliances that FDR forged, and—through co-founding and guiding the Congressional Human Rights Caucus—to further the principles for which President Roosevelt stood.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I raised my voice in protest to a preposterous proposal late last year to replace the portrait of Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the U.S. dime with a picture of Ronald Reagan. We can't let partisan politics simply wipe out national awareness of one of our greatest presidents. Our Nation and the world gained so much from the work of this one extraordinary man.

This spring, the National World War II Memorial will open on the Washington Mall. Along with the unique and moving memorial to FDR nearby—a thought-provoking collection of

sculptures and plaques, fountains and plantings, bordered by the Potomac and the placid Tidal Basin—the new monument will serve to remind Americans and visitors from around the globe of the accomplishments of this legendary leader.

I am proud to contribute now to a congressional statement affirming our appreciation for the life and legacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and I urge all of our colleagues to support H.J. Res. 87.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution honoring the life and legacy of the 32nd President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Unlikely to ever happen again, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency for four terms. Despite the health challenges of polio, his energy, wisdom, talent, and compassion for the common man lifted our country from the Great Depression and led our military against the Axis Powers of World War II.

Following the example of his cousin President Theodore Roosevelt, Roosevelt chose a political-life in service to the public. In 1910, he first entered politics as a State Senator in New York. He went on to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, a Vice-Presidential candidate to James Cox, and then Governor of New York. It was during his governorship that he realized his political career could continue, even with polio. During 1932, with million unemployed, most banks closed, and a world questioning the realities of capitalism, Roosevelt was elected to his first term as President. His determination to resolve devastating economic problems led him to call a Special Session of Congress during the first 100 days of his Presidency. Under his leadership, Congress took up emergency legislation to end the banking crisis and worked towards improving economic problems. Over the next 5 years, Congress passed New Deal legislation. As a country facing large unemployment numbers, this President took bold steps through the Civil Works Administration and the Work Projects Administration to get Americans back to work. Furthermore, these programs led to the improvement of roads and the construction of new schools and libraries. Financial reforms were enacted to prevent future economic collapses. Programs, such as Social Security and unemployment insurance, were created to ensure that all Americans had enough money to survive in times of need. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 brought a minimum wage that guaranteed workers a wage that would keep workers out of poverty. His leadership provided our country with a new way of thinking that gave all citizens basic financial and economic stability. Later, as Hitler's armies marched through Europe and after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, FDR led our country into World War II. As commander-in-chief for most of the war, he was largely responsible for the victory of United States and Allied powers.

The accomplishments of Franklin Delano Roosevelt should be remembered by this Congress. His leadership gave hope to many who faced several years of economic hardships. Legislation passed during his Presidency allowed citizens to regain confidence in the national financial infrastructure. His New Deal programs, still leading political issues today, were significant in finding people new jobs and economic security. As commander-in-chief he successfully led our Nation into victory in World War II. Historians continue to rank him with Washington and Lincoln as one the top three President. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution and this distinguished leader.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in support of H.J. Res. 87, a timely resolution that expresses Congress's admiration and respect for the 20th century's greatest American leader.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt started his political career in New York State by working vigorously for reform movements that would redefine the role of government, and he never stopped. The programs that epitomized the New Deal, had their genesis in Albany. As governor, Roosevelt implemented many of the innovative, progressive policies he would later introduce to the Nation as President. He expanded state assistance to social services and state agencies and eased the hardships on New York's agricultural industry by encouraging tax cuts for small farmers. Upon the onset of the Great Depression, he authorized the New York State Unemployment Relief Act and the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration.

In 1928, Roosevelt won the Democratic nomination for Governor at the Naval Armory in my home city of Rochester, New York. While serving as Governor, his successes elevated him to national prominence, and in 1932, he was elected President of the United States for the first of an unprecedented—and never to be repeated—four terms in office.

In 1932, the Nation was plunged into the Great Depression that affected every American. Businesses failed; soup kitchens were set up to feed the longer and longer lines of the unemployed. Banks failed, mortgages were foreclosed and the Nation was filled with fear and despair. Roosevelt began the most comprehensive and innovative programs to put Americans back to work in our history. The Public Works Administration alone funded over 34,000 projects that put people to work building airports, highways, hospitals, schools, and universities.

His Works Progress Administration (WPA) hired artists to enhance the projects and many of our most beautiful public buildings today were the work of the WPA. These publicly funded arts initiatives put famous artists such as Jackson Pollack, Milton Avery, and Stuart Davis to work. As an interesting side note, the red, white, and blue WPA logo remained on theater playbills and its initials were said to mean "Work Pays America." We cannot forget the Civilian Conservation Corps which built national forests and did remedial work to restore and protect the land.

Banking legislation protected deposits, and Social Security ensured that the elderly would not be destitute. The Tennessee Valley Authority brought electricity to parts of the country for the first time. Veterans returning home were given free education under the GI bill and bought homes with the VA low-rate mortgages. The middle class that emerged as a result of the policies of the Roosevelt administration has been the key to American economic stability, success, and innovation.

He understood the desire of able bodied and able minded Americans to work and created jobs. He led America out of an economic depression not merely by giving government handouts, but by creating jobs.

President Roosevelt showed his natural and inspiring leadership throughout World War II. When the nations of Europe began falling to the Nazis, one by one, the United States was hardly a military superpower. If anything, we were poorly prepared and equipped. In 1939, the U.S. Army had barely entered the new century; we still had cavalry troops. In record time, the innovative partnership Franklin Roosevelt established between government and private enterprise enabled American industry to provide the U.S. military with a fleet of 300,000 planes, 100,000 tanks, and 87,000 warships to contribute in record time to the Allied cause. When the war effort outgrew all available space in Washington, Roosevelt's Department of Defense built the Pentagon in a scant 16 months. Roosevelt's creative, visionary leadership enabled the Allies to marshal the resources, troops and equipment to defeat the Nazis and free most of Europe from their domination.

Franklin Roosevelt embraced the unique capabilities of very individual and worked tirelessly to ensure that all Americans would be able to earn a living and build this great Nation. As a result of initiatives like the PWA, the WPA, and the CCC, the unemployed got jobs, people were able to support their families, and this Nation was able to grow and prosper. I hope that, as public servants, my colleagues will join me in following in his example by supporting honest policies that work to better the lives of American people.

Franklin Roosevelt had great regard for public service, and served with a sense of responsibility and honor. His respect for the American people and the value he placed on their well-being and security drove everything he did. President Roosevelt came to embody strength, hope and resolve during some of the most difficult days in our Nation's history. From the economic distress of the Great Depression to the horrifying attack on Pearl Harbor that caused the Nation to enter World War II, Roosevelt's steadfast leadership ignited an economic engine and calmed a frightened nation.

The legacy of his policies will certainly outlast my lifetime and will continue to benefit my children and grandchildren for years to come. We owe home an unpayable debt of gratitude.

Only those closest to him realized that he couldn't walk unaided. As former Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo said "Franklin Roosevelt lifted himself from his wheelchair to lift this nation from its knees."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt left us with some of the most memorable quotations of the century. He told us that, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." He offered "a new deal" to the Nation, and so perfectly encapsulated the American spirit by saying we would rather "die on our feet than live on our knees." Of all his many wise and eloquent pronouncements, however, I would leave you with this one:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

I am honored to rise today to celebrate the extraordinary life and contributions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I support the adoption of House Joint Resolution 87 that honors President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 87.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 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. KLINE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 551, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3733, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Res. 433, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H.J. Res. 87 will resume tomorrow.

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.

## THANKING C–SPAN FOR ITS SERVICE ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FIRST COVERAGE OF PROCEEDINGS OF HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 551.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 551, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
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
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
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
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—41

Beauprez
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Burr
Crane
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Deutsch
Edwards
Emanuel
Everett
Fattah
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall
Israel
Istook
Kirk
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
Maloney
Meeks (NY)
Oberstar
Obey
Platts
Rahall
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (WA)
Stearns
Tauzin
Toomey
Wexler
Wicker
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1854

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 58 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 58 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## MYRON V. GEORGE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3733.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3733, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 0, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
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
Olver
Ortiz
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)
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
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—39

Beauprez
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Burr
Crane
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Emanuel
Everett
Fattah
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall
Israel
Istook
Kilpatrick
Kirk
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
Maloney
Marshall
Meeks (NY)
Oberstar
Obey
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (WA)
Strickland
Tauzin
Toomey
Wexler
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1901

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LUIS A. FERRÉ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 433.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 433, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
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
Olver
Ortiz
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
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—35

Beauprez
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Burr
Cox
Crane
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Emanuel
Everett
Fattah
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall
Israel
Istook
Kirk
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
Maloney
Meeks (NY)
Oberstar
Obey
Rahall
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (WA)
Tauzin
Wexler
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1918

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I missed rollcall votes 58, 59, and 60. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each measure.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes 58, 59, and 60. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of those votes.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 during the vote on the Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act, H.R. 339, I was present on the floor of the House of Representatives. However, my vote was not registered due to, I guess, my mistake in terms of leaving my card in the machine from the previous vote.

Had this malfunction not occurred, I would have voted ''nay'' on this vote, rollcall vote No. 54.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT FOR WOMEN

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak as the vice chair of the Women's Caucus in this House. Women outlive men by 5.4 years. Unfortunately, women are also spending 18 percent more on our health care. Couple those statistics with the fact that the average woman in Medicare earns half the income of a man and we are facing a very serious problem; that is, affording pharmaceutical drug coverage.

My colleagues and I responded to the problem and created a new voluntary prescription drug benefit in the Medicare bill which we passed last year. The millions of female seniors left widowed, or without a husband's employer insurance coverage, will now have a benefit that will save them almost 60 percent off prescription drugs, if they choose to enroll.

Mr. Speaker, 167,000 elderly women live in the great State of Florida below the poverty level. That is more than two times the number of men in poverty. I am proud to say that my colleagues on the Women's Caucus and I finally did something to assist low-income, elderly women who do not have insurance coverage.

## EXTENDING SYMPATHY TO FAMILIES OF VICTIMS OF TERRORISM INCIDENT IN SPAIN

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, no American will ever forget the infamous day of 9/11. I rise today to offer our sympathies to the people of Spain and those who lost their lives on March 11, 2004. There is no greater tragedy than having this kind of reckless, random, and vicious attack on innocent people. And so to those who have lost their lives, the families of those who have lost their lives, we mourn them. We mourn for them. We link arms in the collective effort in the war against terrorism. But we also stand to promote the concept of peace over war and life over death. We hope that we can join together under the collaborative effort of all of the world's people to begin to stand against terrorism but yet to address this question from a perspective of peace and peace enhancement and empowerment as opposed to war.

Those people now have lost their lives, and their legacy should be not continued tragedy and terrorism but a continued effort to work across the lines that are regional, national, and international to promote peace, together, one and for all.

## INTRODUCTION OF NO SCHOOL LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2004

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

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today in rural Edgecombe County in the community of Battleboro, we announced that we would file a bill tonight called ROLE Model Initiative, Respecting Our Leaders in Education. The event was held at Phillips Middle School in Battleboro where we had more than four dozen education professionals, parents, teachers and students representing rural North Carolina. This bill is being introduced so that we can have our local systems get funding, because we have mandated that they follow the IDEA Act and the No Child Left Behind Act and we have not provided the funds for these acts. One speaker today described these two acts, Individuals With Disabilities Education and No Child Left Behind, as trains on the same track headed toward one another, bound to collide. We want to have a moratorium so the States can opt out of the penalty phase of No Child Left Behind until we fund IDEA.

## PRESIDENT VISITS OHIO IN MIDST OF JOB LOSS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bush came to Cleveland near my district last week to try to defend his economic policies. This is a President who will be the first President since Herbert Hoover who has seen a net loss of jobs during his term. Ohio has lost 3 million jobs since George Bush raised his right hand on January 20, 2001. He has lost 2,000 jobs a week, 260 jobs every single day that he has been President. His response always to bad economic news is more tax cuts for the most privileged, trickle-down economics, hoping something will trickle down to the middle class and more trade agreements like NAFTA that ship jobs overseas.

Tax cuts for the wealthy are not working. Overseas trade agreements like China and PNTR and CAFTA and NAFTA and all the things that he is trying to do, those are not working, either. We need an economic policy that puts working families first. That means job creation. That means those 300,000 Ohioans who have lost jobs can be put back to work.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

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

## ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend Deputy Jason Scott of Tennessee was killed by a 16-year-old barricaded in his home with semiautomatic weapons with 30-round magazines. This must stop. One in five law enforcement officers slain in the line of duty is killed with an assault weapon. Our Nation's police officers have worked hard to keep assault weapons off our streets. That is why Congress must revisit the assault weapons ban without attaching special interest handouts. Otherwise, assault weapons will be back on our streets September 14. That is in 181 days. That is good news for terrorists, cop killers, drug dealers and the terrorists that live among us here in our country. Unfortunately, it is bad news for America's families and police officers.

Since I took the floor a week ago tonight, over 400 Americans have died in this country from gun violence. But instead of the sense of urgency that we should do something about it, the House has stood idly by. Some seem content to let the assault weapons ban expire on September 13. The ban has kept us safer for the last 10 years. It has also respected the rights of gun owners, protecting the hunting rifles, shotguns and pistols favored by law-abiding citizens. Only criminals have been kept from their gun of choice. This explains why 66 percent of gun owners support renewing the ban. The American people support it by even more numbers.

Once again our Nation's law enforcement officers are leading the fight to keep assault weapons off our streets. Before the ban, assault weapons were only 1 percent of privately owned guns but nearly 9 percent of all guns used in crimes. Following the ban's enactment, there were 18 percent fewer assault weapons traced to crime. This is a bill that has worked. It has some flaws in it and that is why I had introduced a bill that would close those loopholes. We know that the gun manufacturers have taken the guns that have been banned, and we know that they have made copycats. Those of you that remember the killings that happened here in D.C. with the D.C. sniper, that is a copycat.

Why do we need these particular guns on the street? I promise that I will never do anything to take away the right of someone to own a gun, but to have assault weapons back on the streets is totally insane and it is insane. The American people feel that they cannot do anything. Well, they can.

□ 1930

They can write to their Congressmen, their Senators, certainly the House Speaker and the President. The President of the United States has said that if he has a bill on the desk, he will sign that bill. I am begging the American people to use their right to be able to talk to their Congressman or their Senator. Let us hear their voices. Otherwise, in 181 days we will have assault weapons back on the street.

We do not even have the time to talk about the health care system and how much it costs from gun violence in this country. It is over $4 billion a year, and the American taxpayer pays for half of that, mainly because those that are injured lose their insurance halfway through their treatment; and, believe me, I know this from experience.

People keep saying they have no voice in the government. They can have a voice. They can have their words be heard by those who represent them here in the House. All I am asking is that we are allowed to bring up the Assault Weapons Ban here on the House floor and have a vote. Have a vote. But right now we are told that the bill will not be brought up. It is going to be allowed to just die.

Ten years ago before I ever came to Congress, I came down here to lobby the people that worked here, to tell them the story and why assault weapons should not be on the streets. Colin Ferguson of the Long Island railroad shooting had 15 bullets in his clips. He was able to get two rounds off, 30 bullets, and each one of those bullets found a mark in a victim. And now we are going to allow the large-capacity clips back on the streets again? This is basically what our men and women are using in war in Iraq.

Please let your voices be heard.

## AIR DOMINANCE AND TRANSFORMATION NEED F/A–22 AND JSF

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the events of September 11, 2001, and the global war on terrorism have shown that our military must continue to transform to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Thirty years ago, it was difficult to predict the nature of the war we are fighting today, to defend freedom and defeat terrorism. This proves that we must continue to develop the most advanced weapons to ensure America's military dominance in the future.

Our Nation's defense is envied by every country in the world. We have built our air, land, and sea fleet with the most advanced technology available. That technology, perfected over decades, ensures the safety of our armed servicemen and servicewomen. In 10 to 20 years, we must be able to say the same thing.

We are in the process of transforming our military into more agile, adaptive, accurate, and adaptable units of war power. The army is shifting its resources to become lighter, more targeted, and quicker in its response time. The Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are developing the next generation of weapons systems that will continue our air and sea dominance.

I support these efforts to move toward the transformation of our military. September 11 changed the way wars are fought. We are fighting enemies hiding in school buses, oftentimes located 2 feet from schools. These unconventional fighters are lurking in the homes of innocent men and women hoping our military will not want to attack citizens. In some cases, our targets are 10 feet from our own military bases. Pinpoint accuracy is crucial to preserving the lives of innocent men, women, and children.

Today I want to focus on two important examples of transformation: the Joint Strike Fighter and the F/A–22 Raptor. The Joint Strike Fighter and the F/A–22 Raptor are essential to transforming our military to meet the challenges of air dominance of the 21st century. As America's new generation of fighter aircraft, these tactical fighters will guarantee air superiority and air dominance for decades to come.

The F/A–22 is the state-of-the-art next-generation fighter aircraft. Undetectable on enemy radar, the F–22 carries a larger weapons load and increased missile range, and it is faster and more maneuverable than its predecessor, the F–15.

The Joint Strike Fighter will be the prime 21st century multi-role fighter for the U.S. Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. The basic Joint Strike Fighter design, with a few modifications to meet each service's needs, will be used for all three services. The Joint Strike Fighter will have the best next-generation avionics, weapons systems, and stealth capacities.

We can no longer rely on weapons and aircraft developed in the 1960s and 1970s to shield us from enemy fire, nor should we settle on using less than superior equipment to guide specific strikes against evil in all parts of the globe. Our land, sea, and air fleet must be equipped for new kinds of warfare. They must be capable of moving together as we head into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our men and women in uniform to give them the very best equipment as soon as possible.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 557, RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–438) on the resolution (H. Res. 561) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

THE REPUBLICAN MEDICARE BILL

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the Republican Medicare bill is so good, why do they have to sell it so hard? That is a question I have been asking myself lately. I bet it is a question the American people are starting to ask too.

When AARP boss Bill Novelli came out for the Bush Medicare privatization bill last year, he launched a $7 million ad campaign to convince seniors he had made the right decision. America's seniors knew better, and 45,000 AARP members quit in protest.

Rather than learn from AARP's mistake, the President is repeating that same mission, this time at taxpayers' expense. The Bush administration is spending almost $14 million on a nationwide taxpayer-financed TV advertising campaign, the goal of which is to ''educate'' seniors on why the new Medicare drug law is not as bad as it appears. Interestingly in this election year, he is running those ads at taxpayers' expense even though the Medicare bill does not take effect for 2 more years.

The Bush administration's Medicare ads were suspect from the start. With the slick look of a campaign spot, they assure seniors that the bill guarantees the same Medicare, the same benefits. It is not the same Medicare. They would not be spending the money and trying so hard to convince us if it were the same Medicare. It is not the same Medicare. All seniors will pay higher deductibles. Millions of seniors will pay higher premiums.

And in terms of more benefits, the new coverage is not even available until 2006. It is far from free, and it is actually less generous than the employer-sponsored retiree coverage many seniors have today. In fact, by jeopardizing these employer-sponsored benefits that some 12 million seniors have today, the new Medicare law is likely to leave millions of those seniors with less coverage than they have today.

''The same Medicare, more benefits.'' It is a catchy soundbite. The Government Accounting Office, the nonpartisan Government Accounting Office, also said it is false advertising. In the people's name with their tax dollars. They said it was false advertising. Now newspapers tell us that the Bush administration is not just manipulating the news; they are inventing it. The administration is using the people's tax dollars literally to hire actors to portray reporters in staged ''interviews'' that look more like the Home Shopping Network than they do legitimate news, and they do a public discourse.

Even the conservative editors at The Plain Dealer, the largest paper in my State in Cleveland, called those ads phony. And that is just the beginning. News reports, real news stories written by real reporters say the $13 million ad campaign, the infomercial-like interviews are just the tip of the iceberg. The administration is reportedly planning to spend another 80 million of the people's tax dollars to push the Medicare bill which is now law. The drug companies, close allies of President Bush and the Republican leadership in Congress, the word on the street is that the drug companies are going to contribute $100 million to President Bush's reelection. No surprise that the drug companies came into this institution and wrote that language and wrote that Medicare law, the parts that the insurance industry did not write in the Medicare law. Those drug companies are also partners in the marketing plan. Drug giant Pfizer recently launched a traveling road show to talk up the law's new coverage. A less credible champion for drug affordability would be hard to find, Mr. Speaker, less credible than Pfizer. After all, it is the same company, Pfizer, that cut off supplies to Canadian pharmacies when my constituents are trying to buy drugs in Canada because they are so much less expensive. The same drug, same packaging, same dosage, just much less expensive. By the way, Pfizer's pitchman is former U.S. Republican Senator Bob Dole, the same Bob Dole who voted against Medicare in 1965, its creation, who was still bragging about his ''no'' vote 30 years later.

There is even more to this story. Last year Medicare's chief actuary, a government employee, the man responsible for actually drawing an honest fiscal picture to tell the Congress and to tell the American people, said the Bush plan would cost well over $500 billion rather than the President's promise and Republican leadership's promise that it costs $400 billion. After the bill was enacted, the administration released a revised estimate, surprise, and said actually it will cost about $530 billion.

The Medicare actuary, a Federal employee, was forbidden by his boss, a Federal employee, a Bush political appointee, who is now, interestingly enough, a drug industry lobbyist, that Medicare actuary was prevented from releasing the plan's true cost under the threat that he would be fired if he talked to the American people about the real cost, if he talked to Congress about the real cost. When he was threatened, he was threatened with the loss of his job by a Bush political appointee who is now a drug company lobbyist.

These actions, Mr. Speaker, by the Bush administration and its drug company allies raise serious questions of judgment and serious questions of conduct by those elected officials and appointed officials, by the President, by the head of the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services, now a drug company lobbyist. I hope these questions will receive careful scrutiny. And still they raise the basic question: If the Republican Medicare bill is so good, why do they have to sell it so hard using 80 million taxpayer dollars?

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, last week there was a quote attributed to JOHN KERRY, the Democratic nominee for President, who said ''I've met foreign leaders who can't go out and say this publicly, but, boy, they look at you and say, 'You got to win this; you got to beat this guy; we need a new policy,' things like that.'' He has not denied the statement.

Quite frankly, whether the statement is accurate or not, and I do not believe it to be accurate, America's foreign policy decisions are not designed to win popularity contests. They are designed to protect and defend America, her citizens, and her allies.

In the days since September 11, there have been those who actually seem to believe that if we had been more understanding of extremist regimes and terrorists that perhaps they would have left us alone. There is a troubling trend in this campaign season. It has become almost formulaic, and we are hearing it from everybody, from the Democratic Presidential candidates on down. Criticize the President, criticize our foreign policy, criticize our country, criticize what we offer, and do it as loudly and as often as they can.

The alternative to President Bush's bold, tough foreign policy that puts terrorists and rogue regimes on the run is one that relies on the international community to take collective action. We have been there. We spent 12 years letting the U.N. throw paper at Saddam Hussein while Saddam's military launched missiles at our pilots, at American pilots enforcing the U.N. no-fly zones over Iraq. For 12 years the U.N. turned a blind eye while such as France allowed its citizens to profit from the Iraq Oil for Food or, as some call it, the Oil for Palaces Program.

International consensus, multilateralism? These are terms the policy wonks and the intellectual elites love to use. They are terms that sound great on paper, but an unyielding dedication to them has proven disastrous in the real world. Multilateralism and collective action are terms that we in the real world know to mean that America should stop leading and let the status quo remain. Those who profited from a status quo that allowed Saddam to remain in power, that allowed terrorists to grow and flourish in Afghanistan do not want us to act.

□ 1945

Nations that have neither the will nor the military capability to take on terrorism on a truly global scale should not criticize those that do.

It was 3,000 Americans, our buildings, our Pentagon that were targeted on September 11, and those responsible needed to know that we were going to do more than lob a few missiles. We have taken steps to reshape the world for the better, and whether this pleases the French is irrelevant. We alone have the capability and the responsibility to stamp out terrorism, and it is to President Bush's credit that he was not deterred by apologists for terrorists and Saddam.

Should America make a turn backward, back to the days when multilateralism and collective action were more important than promoting freedom and targeting terrorism, when we relied on the U.N. to slap dictators on the wrist and sit idly by as Afghanistan became a giant terrorist training camp? If we take that step back, then we are signifying our weakness.

The debate is very clear: Do you prefer that we act preemptively to prevent another September 11? Do you believe swift, decisive action in lands breeding terrorism is preferable to emergency response on the streets of our cities in the aftermath of an attack? Do you want American foreign policy dictated by your elected leaders or those in Europe?

I think the answer to this is clear. We all know the answer to this and, certainly, when we read polls like this one from the Iraqi people who say their life is better today than it was a year ago, we know the answer to that question.

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

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

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5 minutes out of order.

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

There was no objection.

## TAX CUTS DO NOT CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about the continual frustration that Americans feel when it comes to their jobs, or lack of jobs.

The American people are getting mixed messages when it comes to the economy, and we have a responsibility to give it to them straight and put in place the measures that are going to help.

The administration tells the American people that the economy is growing, and we hear today that a new survey shows that 28 percent of employers plan to add workers, but we have yet to see such strong growth. The Congressional Budget Office estimates only 4.8 percent of the gross domestic product growth in 2003, providing strong suggestions that the growth touted by the administration is not sustainable. Not only is that growth not sustainable, the American people are not feeling the effects of it.

My Republican colleagues will say, but the unemployment rate dropped in January. However, by stressing the unemployment rate has dropped to 5.6 percent, they fail to tell the rest of the story that paints the true picture of the job market in our country. Job growth is not following economic growth. Profits are up, but job creation is not. It is that simple. The working-age population has increased by 2.4 percent and needed an additional 4.7 million jobs since March of 2001 just to support these new workers. Instead, jobs since then have decreased by 2.35 million, creating a gap of 7 million jobs lost in the job market.

There are not enough jobs to even sustain the growth in population, much less provide employment for all of our workers affected by plant closures, company downsizing, and the outsourcing. Each month, 125,000 additional Americans want to enter the workforce. These people are not to be confused with our currently unemployed workers; rather, these are Americans who have graduated from high school or college. And, the 112,000 jobs created in January do not even compensate enough for these new workers, much less help absorb the 2.35 million Americans who have lost their jobs since this recession began.

To make matters worse, the economy only created 21,000 jobs in February, and an additional 392,000 civilian workers left the workforce last month. However, the Labor Department's monthly unemployment statistics do not count that 392,000 unemployed workers. They do not count any of the 2.8 million Americans who constitute the ''missing labor force,'' or those who have given up looking for jobs or left the labor market all together. Sure, the unemployment rate can drop if we do not count those who have already left the labor force. But, if we include these workers into the unemployment statistics, the country's current unemployment rate jumps to 7.4 percent.

And what have we done for those who have found themselves laid off or unemployed? The administration cut taxes and said tax cuts will create 306,000 jobs each month. Yet, in 8 months, a total of only 294,000 jobs have been created, not the 2,448,000 that this administration said tax cuts would create. Just a little short.

If the Republican majority is not going to create jobs, they should at least help the country's unemployed by extending unemployment benefits. Again this year, Congress left town before Christmas without providing unemployed Americans with a 13-week temporary extension of their benefits. It is March now, and Congress still has failed to act on this important benefit to unemployed Americans.

The need for extended unemployment benefits is real. This is the longest recession without job recovery since the Bureau of Labor Statistics began collecting data in 1939, since recovering from the Great Depression. This is the longest recession without job recovery. We do not need statistics to demonstrate that need. To those of us who hear from and visit with our unemployed constituents, it is equally clear.

We continue to hear the hollow argument that our recent economic growth

mitigates the need for jobless benefits. There has not been job growth in our country. I would like to talk about a conversation I had with a constituent of mine. Let us call her Mrs. Crawford. Mrs. Crawford, single and 60 years old, was laid off quite some time ago. In January she joined the 80,000 Americans who lose their unemployment benefits each week. I asked Mrs. Crawford if the administration's economic policies have helped her, and she told me that not only did she not receive any tax cuts that were supposed to stimulate the economy, the so-called economic growth as a result of these tax cuts has not increased her job opportunities.

The administration will tell her that the economy is growing, and we do not need extension on jobless benefits, but they have conveniently left out the fact that the temporary extension was created to deal with the very economic conditions we face today. In fact, the program was created when unemployment stood at 5.7 percent and the country had lost 2 million jobs. Now, the unemployment rate is at 5.6 and the country has lost a net of 2.35 million jobs. And with 80,000 Americans losing their unemployment benefits each week with no jobs to go to, there is no doubt about the need for an extension.

The Senate voted last month, 58 to 39, to support an extension. Let us stop sending the American people these symbolic, yet mixed messages of support, and pass a clean bill extending unemployment benefits. If the majority of this Congress is not going to talk straight on the economy, the least they can do is provide Americans with temporary relief.

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

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

## SUPPORTING BUSH ECONOMIC INITIATIVES

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President Bush's economic initiatives. As a former small businessman, I have watched closely as the President's initiatives have improved the economy, even in the aftermath of September 11.

Mr. Speaker, we are getting a lot of backlash from folks who say the economy is not doing well. Well, they are wrong. These are just a few of the positive headlines that are coming out of my district: ''West Texas Housing Moves Up At Record Levels.'' ''Statewide Confidence Index Predicts Economy is on the Upswing.'' ''Jobless Rate the Lowest in Almost 4 Years.'' ''The Economy is Doing Well.''

When President Bush took office, the economy was headed into a recession. The stock market had just collapsed, the manufacturing industry was at an all-time low, and then the United States was hit with the events of 9–11, and then military campaigns on the war on terrorism. Now, durable goods shipments are up, factory orders are up, consumer spending is up. Today the housing ownership rate in America is the highest it has ever been in the history of this country. The President has shown, and I agree, when you put the money in the hands of the small business people in America, they will create jobs. Mr. Speaker, what the President knows and what I know is that the American people know how to spend their own money a lot better than the United States Congress does.

In an article dated just a week ago in Odessa, Texas, saw sales tax revenues rise for the 15th straight month, and the entire Permian Basin showed strong gains and signs of improving. In Odessa, more and more people are employed and they are spending their money, which is strengthening the local economies.

The Democrats are saying, we are not adding jobs to this economy. Well, the truth is, the economy has experienced 6 consecutive months of job growth and has added 364,000 jobs over the last 6 months. There are nearly 3 million more workers now than in early 2002. Basically, more Americans were working in January 2004 than at any other time in the history of this country.

Democrats would have the American people believe that more and more people are being laid off every day. Once again, they are wrong. The unemployment rate is down. Today's rate, in fact, is below the average for the entire decades of the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s. Even when the Democrats ended a temporary extended unemployment benefits program in the 1990s, today's unemployment rate is lower than it was at that time.

The manufacturing arena, which has struggled for 37 months of decline, is reporting expanded employment for the fourth consecutive month. So that when Democrats complain that the industry is hemorrhaging, that is simply not true. Like former President Reagan, I believe fervently that the government should cut taxes and regulations on small businesses, enabling them to do what they do best, and that is create jobs.

Those in the House who oppose these values believe that the Federal Government has an income problem. That is not true. The Federal Government has a spending problem.

When my sons came home from college and said, Dad, I am out of money, can I have some more, the answer was, no, you will have to tighten your budget and work with the money that your mother and I give you. What they know, what I know, and what my colleagues know is the way we cure deficits is not with giving people more money; you encourage them to spend less money. And that is the way the Federal Government should act.

I believe in tax cuts as a solution rather than a contributor to the deficits. I credit President Bush's tax cuts, which were pushed through Congress for an additional 21,000 new jobs just last month.

I served for years in the land development industry, and I watched the market move up and down and back and forth, but more recently I have seen a huge surge in the housing market. More single family homes were purchased in 2003 than any other year in the history of this country, and the homeownership rate in America is at an all-time high. President Bush's initiatives to dismantle the barriers to homeownership include providing down payment assistance through the American Dream Down Payment Initiative, increasing the supply of affordable homes through the Single Family Affordable Housing Tax Credit, and increasing the support for the Self-Help Ownership and Opportunities Program, and increasing home-buying education and counseling.

In June 2002, President Bush issued the American Homeowners Challenge to the real estate and mortgage finance industries to encourage them to join the effort to close the gap that exists between minorities and nonminorities. The President also announced the goal of increasing the number of minority homeownership by at least 5.5 million families before the end of the decade.

Congress has a choice. It can continue to grow the economy and create jobs as the President's policies are doing, or it can raise taxes on American families, hurting the economic recovery and any future job creation.

I stand with small businessmen and women of America who say the President is absolutely right.

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

(Mr. DREIER 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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

## HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise tonight to spend 5 minutes talking about health savings accounts. Clearly, much of the attention that our Nation has given to the medicare drug benefit has focused on the long overdue nature of the fact that we do need a drug benefit for senior citizens on medicare. For instance, Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable that under medicare, expensive heart surgery is paid for, but the far cheaper prescription medications that will prevent senior citizens from having to have expensive heart surgery is not paid for.

□ 2000

And this is a long overdue reform.

But a little noticed section of the Medicare drug benefit legislation deals with health savings accounts.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that in the past we have had medical savings accounts that individuals can use but they have been very flexible and difficult to use. And with this important legislation that now allows for health savings accounts along with House passed efforts for medical liability reform, as well as associated health plans, we are making attempts in the House to lower the cost of health insurance and to improve accessibility.

How do health savings accounts work? Well, first of all, individuals, their family members, or their employers can put tax-free dollars into an IRA-type of account that will be able to be rolled over for use for bona fide medical expenses. An individual can contribute $2,600, a family, couple, $5,150.

As I said, if you do not use all of the health savings account tax-free dollars that you have put into your account in one year, it can roll over, can accumulate so senior citizens can use it, for instance, when they retire, for some expenses that they might not traditionally found Medicare has paid for. It can be part of one's estate, inherited by one's children.

As I indicated before, individuals can contribute to this as can family members or employers. It can be transferred from job to job. And if you are in the age group of 55 to 65, you can do catch-up contributions of up to $1,000 more because retirement is coming along fairly quickly. This increased flexibility is what has made health savings accounts very exciting for people that are looking for market-based mechanisms to reform health care and to improve its delivery across our Nation.

What can health savings accounts be used for? Number one, for bona fide medical expenses. It can be used for many different things that are not traditionally covered by health insurance, chiropractic care, acupuncture. This will enable alternative medicine to get the kind of attention that sometimes is missing from health insurance policies. And it can be used for the purchase of higher-deductible health care policies, $1,000 for an individual, and $2,000 for a family.

So the use of tax-free dollars, Mr. Speaker, for medical attention, for medical care, is going to transform, I believe, the way that we purchase health insurance in this country and how we judge health insurance. Because no longer will it be somebody else's money, an insurance company's money or something like that; it will be our own money that we have earned.

And so the practice of defensive medicine might be shrunk a little bit, unnecessary tests will be diminished because anybody using their health savings account dollars will be using their own money. So we will be much wiser consumers of medical care in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly encourage all Americans who are eligible for health savings accounts to look at them carefully because they are part of the law that has already been implemented.

One can create their own health savings account as of January 1, 2004. And as we approach April 15, it is a good time to think about doing that. Because as I said, like an IRA, they are simple to use, easy to set up, and certainly, when all is said and done, this will transform how we purchase health insurance in our country in a very positive way.

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

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

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

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE HIGH COST OF EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was visited by the Michigan floral shop owners, small business people who were telling me they can hardly afford the private health insurance coverage for their employees. And many of them are going to have to give up the practice of insuring for health purposes their employees because the costs are just too enormous.

I am reminded of a discussion I had with the esteemed president of the United Automobile Workers, Mr. Ron Gettelfinger, who indicated that we have just about run out of how much unions in collective bargaining agreements can continue to give up in terms of the health care, employer-based health care that the United Automobile Workers have been working on for decades because the demands of the corporations, the automobile corporations, continue and insist at every round of collective bargaining to require more and more give-backs, higher premiums, and fewer services to be provided under the employer-employee health plan.

It is also my duty to report to you that I have been advised that DaimlerChrysler Corporation is examining something different from the plan that the Chrysler Corporation, who they succeeded, has been engaged in with the United Automobile Workers in terms of their employee health coverage. It is getting too high, it is costing too much.

And so I am here to continue a discussion that has been going on for many years. And I would like to recommend to my colleagues a few of the things I have been reading about this subject matter and see where it takes it. I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Ron Mueller, the author of a book entitled ''As Sick As It Gets: The Shocking Reality of America's Health Care, a Diagnosis and Treatment Plan,'' which he prescribes in this book.

Here is what he said: Some of the patients had to tell him about their health coverage. One said that, ''When my wife dies I can slow down, I will not need to work so hard to pay for her medications.'' Another said, ''I borrowed my sister's insulin, she has insurance.'' Another, ''I don't have insurance. Actually I do, but I have a $5,000 per year deductible.'' Another, all of his Social Security goes for his medications and his medical bills. ''I am trapped. You work all your life and look forward to retirement and it will not come. I got to work to pay for the pills and the bills.'' Another, ''It was only after my lawyer got involved that they agreed to cover my surgery.''

''Those (expletive deleted) are a bunch of thieves. I called Medicare and they told me not to pay another dime. Then the (expletive deleted) threatened me.''

Another, ''I have a history of using cocaine but I have been drug free for 3 years. Unfortunately, I have had thoughts of using it again and I am afraid I might relapse. So I called my insurance company to see if counseling was covered. The insurance company said I was not covered unless I tested positive. So I have to go out and use the drugs before I am covered. Makes sense, does not it?''

And the final comment, ''The letter said we have covered all your medical bills except $384,000.''

And so it is an important subject that we begin to examine more and more closely as we move forward.

Dr. David Himmelstein, Dr. Steffie Woolhandler, and Dr. Ida Hellander have a book that deals with the consequences of corporate health care. And they make the following points, and I quote: ''Centuries ago, doctors practiced phlebotomy by applying incisions and leaches to their patients. Doctors acted on the misguided belief that illnesses could be cured by bleeding them away. Some patients lost so much blood that it killed them. Today we wonder how they got it so wrong. One day our grandchildren will look back on the damage wrought by corporate health care with an equal sense of bewilderment. They will learn that early in the 21st century, 45 percent of all bankruptcies involved a medical reason or a large medical debt; that 47 percent of those denied authorization for emergency room care by their HMOs had unstable vital signs or other high-risk indicators; the death rates and patient expenses are higher at the for-profit hospitals than at nonprofit facilities; that doctors are actually paid money to withhold medical services; that in a solid economy, infant mortality rates for African Americans are more than twice those for whites. And perhaps most baffling is the continued existence of a corporate system when 77 percent of Americans believe the government should provide quality medical coverage to all adults.''

And so their book, with extraordinary detail, is a compelling argument in favor of a national health care program, a program that would cover everyone and provide better care for less than what we spend today.

I want to emphasize that. We could spend less with a reorganized national health care system than we are spending today. How could that be? How could we get better care for less money?

Well, one simple answer would be to take the incredible profit taking that goes on within the health care industry. It is amazing; 47 percent, or 45.6 percent to be precise, of all bankruptcies involve a medical reason or a large medical debt; 326,441 families identified illness as the main reason for bankruptcy in the year 1999. An additional 269,757 had large medical debts at the time of bankruptcy. And that 7 per 1,000 single women and 5 per 1,000 men suffered a medical-related bankruptcy in the year 1999.

This is from the Norton's Bankruptcy Advisor, which is the source of those statistics.

□ 2015

So we could do a lot for our Nation's citizens by revisiting health care.

We have some other issues that relate to this subject that I think are pretty important. We have here another interesting book, soft cover, put together by the staff of the New York Times. It is called ''Solving America's Health-Care Crisis, A Guide to Understanding the Greatest Threat to Your Family's Economic Security,'' and so they point out to us that this great problem is the biggest one that confronts the most Americans.

''The labyrinth of issues involved in understanding this crisis is daunting,'' and so they provide for a primer that will help all of us make judgments about the complicated health care issues now plaguing the country. This New York Times staff provides searching reportage and penetrating analysis and tells what works and what does not, who profits and who loses and what might or might not be done to fix a health care industry on the brink of collapse.

What is done in this book that is most interesting is to examine how high technology and high medical costs both save lives and at the same time hurt growing numbers of Americans, how other countries, for example, handle health care better than we do. As a matter of fact, all of the industrialized nations of the world have a national health care plan that does not turn on whether a person has the right insurance company or carries the right provisions within the health care plan before it can be covered, whether or not a person can independently afford to pay for it.

This book, ''Solving America's Health-Care Crisis,'' examines how some doctors profit from patients by becoming high-tech entrepreneurs; and so it seems to many of us that it is correct to say that the key to America's economic fate lies in health care reform, and so I would like to thank Mr. Eric Eckholm, who led the team that put this very interesting discussion together.

We are forced now to examine whether, with the hundreds and hundreds of proposals of bills in both the House and the Senate relating to health care and health care delivery, to Medicare and Medicaid, to Social Security, how we are going to more quickly improve the system that we are working on; and I look forward to discussions with my colleagues, informally, about what we must do to deal with this subject.

I would like now to turn to a very interesting statement that has been put forward by my friend, the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, in which he asserted that 130 nations backed us in the war against Iraq. There are 191 countries in the United Nations. There are some 40 or more that are not in the United Nations, and there may be as much as a dozen who are neither in the United Nations nor are formally organized and recognized as nation states. We are talking about a lot of people, 6.4 billion people in the world, more than 250 countries, and 130 of them backed us up.

I have sent a note, and I will include it in the RECORD, asking the Secretary to advise me of which of these countries contributed to our success in the war in Iraq.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, March 16, 2004.*

Hon. COLIN POWELL,
*Secretary, Department of State, Washington, DC.*

Urgent Attn: Office of the Secretary.

DEAR SECRETARY POWELL: I write to request a specific identification from your office of the countries who support the United States' decision to declare war on Iraq. In your statement regarding the matter, it was your position that approximately 130 countries were behind the U.S. in this war. I would appreciate your urgent assistance in providing a list of these countries at your earliest possible convenience.

Thank you for your kind assistance in this matter, and if you need any further information relevant to this request, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at 202–225–5126.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.
*Ranking Member.*

May I indicate, that it has been brought to the attention of the Roll Call newspaper that the question of whether the legality of the government-sponsored ads promoting the new Medicare prescription drug benefit is appropriate or indeed legal. GAO, of course, the investigative arm of the Congress, wants to find out whether this ad program launched by the administration violates a Federal law prohibiting the government from disseminating ''covert propaganda,'' and so we await the examination and report of the General Accounting Office.

It has been commented by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) that there are a number of questions that

are related to this very important subject.

IRAQ

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with Iraq, we had the benefit of the Committee on Government Reform, which has had a study done about this, which runs some 30 pages, that raises the question of the Bush administration's public statements on Iraq. It is called ''Iraq on the RECORD,'' and there have been questions raised in several areas. I will include this report in the Record, which was prepared at the request of the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN); but this table of contents, and this has been released today, special investigations division, raises the question of the number and timing of misleading statements on the part of the administration.

IRAQ ON THE RECORD—THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON IRAQ

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On March 19, 2003, U.S. forces began military operations in Iraq. Addressing the nation about the purpose of the war on the day the bombing began, President Bush stated: ''The people of the United States and our friends and allies will not live at the mercy of an outlaw regime that threatens the peace with weapons of mass murder.''

One year later, many doubts have been raised regarding the Administration's assertions about the threat posed by Iraq. Prior to the war in Iraq, the President and his advisors repeatedly claimed that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction that jeopardized the security of the United States. The failure to discover these weapons after the war has led to questions about whether the President and his advisors were candid in describing Iraq's threat.

This report, which was prepared at the request of Rep. Henry A. Waxman, is a comprehensive examination of the statements made by the five Administration officials most responsible for providing public information and shaping public opinion on Iraq: President George Bush, Vice President Richard Cheney, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice. It finds that the five officials made misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 125 public appearances. The report and an accompanying database identify 237 specific misleading statements by the five officials.

METHODOLOGY

The Special Investigations Division compiled a database of statements about Iraq made by President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice. All of the statements in the database were drawn from speeches, press conferences and briefings, interviews, written statements, and testimony by the five officials.

This Iraq on the Record database contains statements made by the five officials that were misleading at the time they were made. The database does not include statements that appear in hindsight to be erroneous but were accurate reflections of the views of intelligence officials at the time they were made. The entire database is accessible to members of Congress and the public at www.reform.house.gov/min.

This report is a summary of the Iraq on the Record database. Because the officials' statements have been compiled into a searchable database, the report can make new observations about the topics that were the subject of misleading claims, the timing of these claims, and the officials who were responsible. To ensure objectivity, the report was peer reviewed for fairness and accuracy by two leading experts: Joseph Cirincione, senior associate and director of the Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Greg Thielmann, former acting director of the Office of Strategic, Proliferation, and Military Affairs in the Department of State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research.

FINDINGS

Number of Misleading Statements. The Iraq on the Record database contains 237 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq that were made by President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice. These statements were made in 125 separate appearances, consisting of 40 speeches, 26 press conferences and briefings, 53 interviews, 4 written statements, and 2 congressional testimonies. Most of the statements in the database were misleading because they expressed certainty where none existed or failed to acknowledge the doubts of intelligence officials. Ten of the statements were simply false.

Timing of the Statements. The statements began at least a year before the commencement of hostilities in Iraq, when Vice President Cheney stated on March 17, 2002: ''We know they have biological and chemical weapons.'' The Administration's misleading statements continued through January 22, 2004, when Vice President Cheney insisted: ''There's overwhelming evidence that there was a connection between al-Qaeda and the Iraqi government.'' Most of the misleading statements about Iraq—161 statements—were made prior to the start of the war. But 76 misleading statements were made by the five Administration officials after the start of the war to justify the decision to go to war.

The 30-day period with the greatest number of misleading statements was the period before the congressional vote on the Iraq war resolution. Congress voted on the measure on October 10 and October 11, 2002. From September 8 through October 8, 2002, the five officials made 64 misleading statements in 16 public appearances. A large number of misleading statements were also made during the two months before the war began. Between January 19 and March 19, 2003, the five officials made 48 misleading statements in 26 public appearances.

Topics of the Statements. The 237 misleading statements can be divided into four categories. The five officials made 11 statements that claimed that Iraq posed an urgent threat; 81 statements that exaggerated Iraq's nuclear activities; 84 statements that overstated Iraq's chemical and biological weapons capabilities; and 61 statements that misrepresented Iraq's ties to al Qaeda.

Statements by President Bush. Between September 12, 2002, and July 17, 2003, President Bush made 55 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 27 separate public appearances. On October 7, 2002, three days before the congressional votes on the Iraqi war resolution, President Bush gave a speech in Cincinnati, Ohio, with 11 misleading statements, the most by any of the five officials in a single appearance.

Some of the misleading statements by President Bush include his statement in the January 28, 2003, State of the Union address that ''the British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa''; his statement on October 2, 2002, that ''the Iraqi regime is a threat of unique urgency''; and his statement on May 1, 2003, that ''the liberation of Iraq . . . removed an ally of al Qaeda.''

*Statements by Vice President Cheney.* Between March 17, 2002, and January 22, 2004, Vice President Cheney made 51 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 25 separate public appearances.

Some of the misleading statements by Vice President Cheney include his statement on September 8, 2002, that ''we do know, with absolute certainty, that he is using his procurement system to acquire the equipment he needs . . . to build a nuclear weapon''; his statement on March 16, 2003, that ''we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons''; and his statement on October 10, 2003, that Saddam Hussein ''had an established relationship with al Qaeda.''

*Statements by Secretary Rumsfeld.* Between May 22, 2002, and November 2, 2003, Secretary Rumsfeld made 52 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 23 separate public appearances.

Some of the misleading statements by Secretary Rumsfeld include his statement on November 14, 2002, that within ''a week, or a month'' Saddam Hussein could give his weapons of mass destruction to al Qaeda, which could use them to attack the United States and kill ''30,000, or 100,000 . . . human beings''; his statement on January 29, 2003, that Saddam Hussein's regime ''recently was discovered seeking significant quantities of uranium from Africa''; and his statement on July 13, 2003, that there ''was never any debate'' about whether Iraq had a nuclear program.

*Statements by Secretary Powell.* Between April 3, 2003, and October 3, 2003, Secretary Powell made 50 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 34 separate public appearances.

Secretary Powell sometimes used caveats and qualifying language in his public statements. His statements that contained such cautions or limitations were not included in the database. Nonetheless, many of Secretary Powell's statements did not include these qualifiers and were misleading in their expression of certainty, such as his statement on May 22, 2003, that ''there is no doubt in our minds now that those vans were designed for only one purpose, and that was to make biological weapons.''

*Statements by National Security Advisor Rice.* Between September 8, 2002, and September 28, 2003, National Security Advisor Rice made 29 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 16 separate public appearances.

Although Ms. Rice had the fewest public appearances and the fewest misleading statements, she had the highest number of statements—8—that were false. These false statements included several categorical assertions that no one in the White House knew of the intelligence community's doubts about the President's assertion that Iraq sought to import uranium from Africa.

I. INTRODUCTION

The President and his senior advisors have a special obligation to describe accurately the national security threats facing the Nation. This special obligation derives in part from the nature of the subject. There is no decision that is more grave than sending our armed forces to battle. The special obligation also derives in part from the unique access that the President and his advisors have to classified information. On matters of national security, only the President and his advisors have full access to the relevant classified information. Members of Congress and the public see only a partial picture based on the information the President and his advisors decide to release.

Recently, serious questions have been raised regarding whether President Bush and his Administration met this special obligation. Numerous news reports and columns have questioned the accuracy of specific statements by President Bush and other Administration officials. The White House maintains that any misstatements were ''only a small part of an 'overwhelming' case that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein posed a threat to the United States.'' Other observers, though, have detected a pattern of consistent misrepresentation.

The one-year anniversary of the beginning of military operations in Iraq marks an occasion for comprehensively assessing whether the President and his senior advisors met their obligation to accurately present intelligence to the American public. For this reason, Rep. Waxman asked the Special Investigations Division to assemble in a single database any misleading statements made by President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and other senior Administration officials about the threat posed by Iraq. This report summarizes key findings from this Iraq on the Record database. The database itself is available to members of Congress and the public at www.reform.house.gov/min.

II. METHODOLOGY

The Iraq on the Record database contains statements from the five Administration officials most responsible for providing public information and shaping public opinion on the Iraq war: President George Bush; Vice President Richard Cheney; Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld; Secretary of State Colin Powell; and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice.

The statements in the database are drawn from 125 public statements or appearances in which the five officials discussed the threat posed by Iraq. The sources of the statements are 40 speeches, 26 press conferences and briefings, 53 interviews, 4 written statements and articles, and 2 appearances before congressional committees. Quotes from the officials in newspaper articles or other similar secondary sources were not included in the database because of the difficulty of discerning the context of such quotes and ensuring their accuracy. Statements made by the officials before March 2002, one year before the commencement of hostilities in Iraq, were also not included.

The database contains statements that were misleading based on what was known to the Administration at the time the statements were made. In compiling the database, the Special Investigations Division did not assess whether ''subjectively'' the officials believed a specific statement to be misleading. Instead, the investigators used an ''objective'' standard. For purposes of the database, a statement is considered ''misleading'' if it conflicted with what intelligence officials knew at the time or involved the selective use of intelligence or the failure to include essential qualifiers or caveats.

The database does not include statements that appear mistaken only in hindsight. If a statement was an accurate reflection of U.S. intelligence at the time it was made, the statement is excluded from the database even if it now appears erroneous.

To determine whether a statement was misleading, the Special Investigations Division examined the statement in light of intelligence known to the Administration at the time of the statement. The primary sources for determining the intelligence available to the Administration were (1) the portions of the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate that have been released to the public, (2) the February 5, 2004, statement by Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet entitled Iraq and Weapons of Mass Destruction, (3) the recent report of the nonpartisan Carnegie Endowment for International Peace entitled WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications, and (4) news and other reports quoting U.S. officials regarding the intelligence available to the administration on Iraq.

In general, hypothetical and implied statements about threats posed by Iraq were not included in the database of misleading statements. A few such statements were included, however, where they implied a threat in evocative and frightening language. These statements were misleading because the effect was to instill in the public the perception that the threat actually existed.

To be conservative, the Special Investigations Division excluded hundreds of statements by the five officials that many observers would consider misleading. For example, the five officials made numerous claims that Iraq ''had'' stockpiles of chemical weapons. Many of these statements were misleading in that they implied that Iraq possessed these stockpiles currently and did not acknowledge the doubts of intelligence experts. Nevertheless, these statements were not included in the database when they were expressed in the past tense because Iraq did possess chemical weapons at least as late as the early 1990s and used them during the 1980s.

Investigators also excluded scores of statements of certainty that Iraq possessed ''weapons of mass destruction'' prior to the war. To many observers, these statements would be misleading because they implied that Iraq possessed nuclear weapons without acknowledging the division among intelligence officials about whether this was the case. The Special Investigations Division excluded these general ''weapons of mass destruction'' assertions, however, because of the ambiguity inherent in the phrase.

The Special Investigations Division asked two leading independent experts to peer review this report for fairness and accuracy. These two independent experts are: Joseph Cirincione, senior associate and director of the Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Greg Thielmann, former acting director of the Office of Strategic, Proliferation, and Military Affairs in the Department of State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. These experts judged that this report is a fair and accurate depiction of the administration's statements.

III. NUMBER AND TIMING OF MISLEADING STATEMENTS

President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice repeatedly made misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq. They made these statements in 125 separate public appearances. The total number of misleading statements made by the five officials is 237.

The 237 misleading statements were made in a variety of forums. On 53 occasions, the five officials gave interviews in which they made claims that were misleading. They also made misleading statements in 40 speeches, 26 press conferences and briefings, 4 written statements and articles, and 2 appearances before Congress.

The misleading statements began at least one year before the start of the war in Iraq, when Vice President Cheney stated on March 17, 2002: ''The President's made it clear that we are concerned about nations such as Iraq developing weapons of mass destruction. We know the Iraqis have been engaged in such efforts over the years. We know they have biological and chemical weapons. . . . And we also have reason to believe they're pursuing the acquisition of nuclear weapons.''

These misleading statements have continued through at least January 2004. On January 22, 2004, Vice President Cheney said in a National Public Radio interview, ''I think there's overwhelming evidence that there was a connection between al-Qaeda and the Iraqi government. . . . I'm very confident that there was an established relationship there.'' He also said in the same interview, ''we know . . . that prior to our going in that he had spent time and effort acquiring mobile biological weapons labs, and we're quite confident he did, in fact, have such a program. We've found a couple of semi trailers at this point which we believe were, in fact, part of that program.'' As described below, both of these assertions were misleading in that they failed to disclose the serious doubts held by intelligence officials.

The majority of the misleading statements—161—were made in the buildup to the war in Iraq. The volume of misleading statements by the five officials peaked before key decision points in the buildup to the war. Congress began debate on the Iraq war resolution in early October 2002 and voted on the measure on October 10 and October 11, 2002. During the 30 days between September 8 and October 8, 2002, the five officials made 64 misleading statements in 16 public appearances. This was the highest number of misleading statements for any 30-day period.

There were also a large number of misleading statements in the two months before hostilities began on March 19, 2003, when the five officials made 48 misleading statements in 26 public appearances.

Most of the misleading statements in the Iraq on the Record database involve the selective use of intelligence or the failure to include essential qualifiers or caveats. For example, statements of certainty that Iraq was close to possessing nuclear weapons were misleading because they ignored significant doubts and disagreement in the U.S. intelligence community regarding whether Iraq was actively pursuing a nuclear program.

In 10 instances, however, the statements included in the database were false statements that directly contradicted facts known at the time by the Administration. For example, on July 11, 2003, Ms. Rice stated with respect to the claim that Iraq was seeking uranium in Africa: ''Now, if there were doubts about the underlying intelligence . . . those doubts were not communicated to the President, to the Vice President, or to me.'' This statement is false because, as Ms. Rice's deputy Stephen Hadley subsequently acknowledged, the CIA sent Ms. Rice and Mr. Hadley memos in October 2002 warning against the use of this claim.

IV. CATEGORIES OF MISLEADING STATEMENTS

The misleading statements by President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice fall into four general categories: (1) statements suggesting that Iraq posed an urgent threat, (2) statements regarding Iraq's nuclear activities, (3) statements regarding Iraq's biological and chemical weapons capabilities, and (4) statements regarding Iraq's support of al Qaeda.

A. STATEMENTS THAT IRAQ POSED AN URGENT THREAT

On February 5, 2004, Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet categorically stated that the U.S. intelligence community ''never said there was an 'imminent' threat.'' Yet this was not the impression conveyed by President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice in their public statements on Iraq. In 10 different appearances, these five officials made 11 statements claiming that Iraq posed an urgent threat.

For example: President Bush stated on October 2, 2002: ''The Iraqi regime is a threat of

unique urgency. . . . [I[t has developed weapons of mass death.'' President Bush stated on November 20, 2002: ''Today the world is . . . uniting to answer the unique and urgent threat posed by Iraq.'' Vice President Cheney stated on August 26, 2002: ''Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us.''

In one instance, Secretary Rumsfeld said that Iraq could give weapons of mass destruction to al Qaeda in ''a week, or a month,'' resulting in the deaths of up to 100,000 people. On November 14, 2002, Secretary Rumsfeld stated: ''Now, transport yourself forward a year, two years, or a week, or a month, and if Saddam Hussein were to take his weapons of mass destruction and transfer them, either use them himself, or transfer them to the Al-Qaeda, and somehow the Al-Qaeda, and somehow the Al-Qaeda were to engage in an attack on the United States, or an attack on U.S. forces overseas, with a weapon of mass destruction you're not talking about 300, or 3,000 people potentially being killed, but 30,000, or 100,000 . . . human beings.''

B. STATEMENTS ABOUT IRAQ'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

In their potential for destruction and their ability to evoke horror, nuclear weapons are in a class by themselves. As Dr. David Kay, former special advisor to the Iraq Survey Group, testified on January 28, 2004: ''All of us have and would continue to put the nuclear weapons in a different category. It's a single weapon that can do tremendous damage, as opposed to multiple weapons that can do the same order of damage. . . . I think we should politically treat nuclear as a difference.''

For precisely this reason, the Administration's statements about Iraq's nuclear capabilities had a large impact on congressional and public perceptions about the threat posed by Iraq. Many members of Congress were more influenced by the Administration's nuclear assertions than by any other piece of evidence. Rep. Waxman, for example, wrote to President Bush in June 2003 that in voting for the Iraq war resolution: ''Like other members, I was particularly influenced by your views about Iraq's nuclear intentions. Although chemical and biological weapons can inflict casualties, no threat is greater than the threat of nuclear weapons.'' Numerous members of Congress stressed Iraq's nuclear threat in their floor statements explaining their support of the resolution.

Despite the significance of the nuclear issue, President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Powell, Secretary Rumsfeld, and National Security Advisor Rice repeatedly misrepresented the nuclear threat posed by Iraq. The five officials made 49 separate public appearances in which they made misleading statements about Iraq's nuclear threat. In these appearances, they made a total of 81 misleading statements regarding Iraq's nuclear activities.

These misleading statements generally fall into one of three categories: (1) misleading statements about the status of Iraq's nuclear program, (2) misleading statements about the purpose of aluminum tubes sought by Iraq, and (3) misleading statements about Iraq's attempts to obtain uranium from Africa.

*1. Claims about the Status of Iraq's Nuclear Program*

Prior to the war, there were significant divisions within the intelligence community about whether Iraq had resumed efforts to make nuclear weapons. In his speech on February 5, 2004, Mr. Tenet explained that there was not unanimity on whether Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear program and that these differences were described in the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE): ''Let me be clear, where there were differences, the Estimate laid out the disputes clearly.'' In particular, the State department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) concluded in the NIE that ''[t]he activities we have detected do not, however, add up to a compelling case that Iraq is currently pursuing what INR would consider to be an integrated and comprehensive approach to acquire nuclear weapons.'' INR added: ''Lacking persuasive evidence that Baghdad has launched a coherent effort to reconstitute its nuclear weapons program, INR is unwilling to speculate that such an effort began soon after the departure of UN inspectors.'' The INR position was similar to the conclusions of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which concluded that there was ''no indication of resumed nuclear activities . . . nor any indication of nuclear-related prohibited activities.''

These doubts and qualifications, however, were not communicated to the public. Instead, the five Administration officials repeatedly made unequivocal comments about Iraq's nuclear program. For example, President Bush said in October 2002 that ''[t]he regime has the scientists and facilities to build nuclear weapons and is seeking the materials required to do so.'' Several days later, President Bush asserted that Saddam Hussein ''is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon.''

Vice President Cheney made perhaps the single most egregious statement about Iraq's nuclear capabilities, claiming: ''we know he has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons.'' He made this statement just three days before the war. He did not admit until September 14, 2003, that his statement was wrong and that he ''did misspeak.''

President Bush and others portrayed the threat of Saddam Hussein waging nuclear war against the United States or its allies as one of the most urgent reasons for preemptively attacking Iraq. Administration officials used evocative language and images. On the eve of congressional votes on the Iraq war resolution, for example, President Bush stated: ''Knowing these realities, America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence or peril, we cannot wait for the final proof—the smoking gun—that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud.''

Following the commencement of military operations in Iraq, Administration officials continued to make misleading statements regarding Iraq's nuclear program. For example, Secretary Rumsfeld denied on July 13, 2003, that there was ''any debate'' about Iraq's nuclear capabilities within the Administration, stating: ''We said they had a nuclear program. That was never any debate.''

Since the war ended, the Iraq Survey Group has been unable to find evidence of the nuclear program described by the five officials. On October 2, 2003, David Kay reported that ''we have not uncovered evidence that Iraq undertook significant post-1998 steps to actually build nuclear weapons or produce fissile material.'' In his January 28, 2004, testimony, Dr. Kay reported that ''[i]t was not a reconstituted, full-blown nuclear program.'' He added, ''As best as has been determined . . . in 2000 they had decided that their nuclear establishment had deteriorated to such point that it was totally useless.'' His conclusion was that there was ''no doubt at all'' that Iraq had less of an ability to produce fissile material in 2001 than in 1991. According to Dr. Kay, the nuclear program had been ''seriously degraded'' and the ''activities of the inspectors in the early '90s did a tremendous amount.''

*2. Claims about the Aluminum Tubes*

In 2001 and 2002, shipments of aluminum tubes to Iraq were intercepted. This discovery led to an active debate within intelligence agencies about the intended use of the tubes.

Numerous experts believed the tubes were for conventional rockets rather than a nuclear development program. In his February 5, 2004, speech, Mr. Tenet explained that disagreement over the purpose of the aluminum tubes was ''a debate laid out extensively in the estimate and one that experts still argue over.'' The agency with the most technical expertise in this area, the Department of Energy, believed that the tubes likely were not part of a nuclear enrichment program, stating in the NIE that ''the tubes probably are not part of the program.'' The International Atomic Energy Agency agreed, concluding: ''There is no indication that Iraq has attempted to import aluminum tubes for use in centrifuge enrichment.''

In addition to dissent from the Energy Department and international inspectors, the State Department also expressed formal reservations, stating in the NIE that ''INR is not persuaded that the tubes in question are intended for use as centrifuge rotors.'' Instead, the State Department accepted the ''judgment of technical experts at the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) who have concluded that the tubes Iraq seeks to acquire are poorly suited for use in gas centrifuges.'' The State Department explained its position in detail: The very large quantities being sought, the way the tubes were tested by the Iraqis, and the atypical lack of attention to operational security in the procurement efforts are among the factors, in addition to the DOE assessment, that led INR to conclude that the tubes are not intended for use in Iraq's nuclear weapon program.

According to the NIE, ''INR considers it far more likely that the tubes are intended for another purpose, most likely the production of artillery rockets.''

These doubts about the use of the aluminum tubes were not conveyed by Administration officials, however. Instead, the aluminum tubes became one of the two principal pieces of information cited by the Administration to support the claim that Iraq was reconstituting its nuclear weapons program. President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice made 10 misleading statements in 9 public appearances about the significance of the aluminum tubes.

For example, Ms. Rice stated on September 8, 2002: ''We do know that there have been shipments going into . . . Iraq . . . of aluminum tubes that . . . are only really suited for nuclear weapons programs, centrifuge programs.'' Similarly, Vice President Cheney said on September 8, 2002: ''[Saddam Hussein] now is trying, through his illicit procurement network, to acquire the equipment he needs to be able to enrich uranium to make the bombs . . . [s]pecifically aluminum tubes.'' These statements were misleading because they did not present the possibility that the tubes were suitable or intended for another purpose, or acknowledge that key U.S. experts doubted that the tubes were intended to make nuclear bombs.

In one instance, Secretary Powell did acknowledge that some experts disputed that the aluminum tubes were intended for nuclear uses. In his February 5, 2003, address before the United Nations, Secretary Powell stated, ''By now, just about everyone has heard of these tubes and we all know that there are differences of opinion. There is

controversy about what these tubes are for. Most U.S. experts think they are intended to serve as rotors in centrifuges used to enrich uranium.'' Even in that statement, however, Secretary Powell did not make clear that experts from the Department of Energy and the State Department's own intelligence division played a significant role in the analysis of this issue and in formal and deliberate dissents had disputed the view that the tubes would likely be used to enrich uranium.

On another occasion, Secretary Powell cited the tubes as evidence of pursuit of nuclear weapons, without noting that the intended use of the tubes was under dispute, asserting: ''We also know that Iraq has tried to obtain high-strength aluminum tubes, which can be used to enrich uranium in centrifuges for a nuclear weapons program.''

By January 27, 2003, the International Atomic Energy Agency had reached the tentative conclusion that the aluminum tubes ''would be consistent with the purpose stated by Iraq and, unless modified, would not be suitable for manufacturing centrifuges.'' Following the occupation of Iraq, the Iraq Survey Group did not find evidence indicating that the tubes were intended for nuclear use. In his January 28, 2004, testimony, Dr. Kay announced: ''It is my judgment, based on the evidence that was collected . . . that it's more probable that those tubes were intended for use in a conventional missile program, rather than in a centrifuge program.''

*3. Claims about Uranium from Africa*

Another significant component of the Administration's nuclear claims was the assertion that Iraq had sought to import uranium from Africa. As one of few new pieces of intelligence, this claim was repeated multiple times by Administration officials as proof that Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program. In total, the five Administration officials made misleading assertions about Iraq's attempts to obtain uranium from Africa in 7 statements in 6 public appearances.

In his State of the Union address on January 28, 2003, President Bush stated: ''The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. . . . Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide.''

Other officials echoed this statement. In a January 23, 2003, New York Times op-ed piece, Ms. Rice argued that Iraq had lied in its December 2002 declaration, noting: ''the declaration fails to account for or explain Iraq's efforts to get uranium from abroad.'' In his opening remarks in his televised press conference on January 29, 2003, Secretary Rumsfeld stated, ''[Saddam Hussein's] regime . . . recently was discovered seeking significant quantities of uranium from Africa.''

These claims that Iraq was seeking to import uranium were misleading. The documentary evidence behind the assertions was declared to be ''not authentic'' by the International Atomic Energy Agency. An envoy, former Ambassador Joseph Wilson, was sent by the CIA to investigate the alleged purchase. Ambassador Wilson concluded that it was ''highly doubtful that any such transaction had ever taken place,'' and on his return, he provided detailed briefings to the CIA and to the State Department African Affairs Bureau.

When evidence emerged that the importation claim was false, Ms. Rice claimed that the White House had no knowledge of these doubts. She asserted unequivocally that no senior White House officials were informed about questions about the uranium claim prior to its use in the State of the Union address. She stated that ''[t]he intelligence community did not know at that time, or at levels that got to us . . . that there was serious questions about this report.'' As she put it on another occasion: ''[H]ad there been even a peep that the agency did not want that sentence in or that George Tenet did not want that sentence in, that the Director of Central Intelligence did not want it in, it would have been gone.''

Ms. Rice's claims were simply false. The CIA sent two memos to the National Security Council—one of which was addressed to Ms. Rice personally—warning against including the claim in a speech by the President. Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet also ''argued personally'' to Ms. Rice's deputy national security adviser, Stephen Hadley, ''that the allegation should not be used'' by the President. Further, in the October 2002 NIE provided to top White House officials, the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research had stated that claims that Iraq sought to acquire uranium in Africa were ''highly dubious.''

Ultimately, the White House was forced to admit its error. On July 9, 2003, White House spokesperson Ari Fleischer said that the statement about importing uranium from Africa ''should not have risen to the level of a presidential speech.'' The White House minimized the significance of the Administration's use of the Niger claim, arguing that it was ''only a small part of an 'overwhelming' case that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein posed a threat to the United States.''

C. STATEMENTS ABOUT IRAQ'S CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS PROGRAMS

President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice made misleading statements regarding Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs in 61 public appearances. In these appearances, the five officials made 84 different misleading statements. These statements addressed three general topics: (1) Iraq's chemical and biological weapons, (2) Iraq's efforts to build unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), and (3) Iraq's mobile biological laboratories.

*1. Claims about Chemical and Biological Weapons*

Prior to the war, there were questions within the intelligence community about whether Iraq in fact possessed stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons. Because Iraq previously had such stockpiles, had used them in the past, and had not adequately demonstrated that all previously produced stockpiles had been destroyed, the intelligence community made an assessment in the October NIE that it was likely that Iraq continued to possess them. Because intelligence agencies had no direct evidence of such stockpiles, however, the conclusions in the October NIE were cast in the context of an intelligence ''estimate.'' The NIE began its sections on chemical and biological weapons with the phrases ''we assess'' and ''we judge.'' The NIE concluded that Iraq ''probably'' had stockpiled chemicals and ''probably'' had genetically engineered biological agents. The NIE also included major qualifiers, such as: ''We lack specific information on many key aspects of Iraq's WMD programs.''

Other intelligence assessments specifically cited the uncertainty surrounding Iraq's possession of such stockpiles. In September 2002, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) issued a report that concluded: ''There is no reliable information on whether Iraq is producing and stockpiling chemical weapons or where Iraq has—or will—establish its chemical warfare agent production facilities.'' The report also observed that ''[a] substantial amount of Iraq's chemical warfare agents, precursors, munitions, and production equipment were destroyed between 1991 and 1998 as a result of Operation Desert Storm and UNSCOM (United Nations Special Commission) actions.'' While the report assessed that Iraq ''probably'' retained some ''CW agents,'' it warned that ''we lack any direct information.''

Despite these uncertainties among the intelligence officials, the five Administration officials made 45 misleading statements in 35 appearances about Iraq's possession of chemical or biological weapons. Often these statements were misleading because they projected certainty about their claims. Secretary Powell, for example, claimed, ''there is no doubt in our mind that he still has chemical weapons stocks.'' Secretary Rumsfeld stated: ''He has at this moment stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons.'' Vice President Cheney asserted: ''We know they have biological and chemical weapons.'' And President Bush said bluntly, ''He's got them.''

Administration officials sometimes claimed to have specific details about stockpile locations and movements. In his speech to the United Nations, for example, Secretary Powell showed photographs of supposed Iraqi chemical stockpiles, stating: ''How do I know that? How can I say that? Let me give you a closer look. Look at the image on the left. On the left is a close-up of one of the four chemical bunkers. The two arrows indicate the presence of sure signs that the bunkers are storing chemical munitions.''

Secretary Rumsfeld was even more specific, claiming that the Iraqis were ''moving them to different locations as often as every 12 to 24 hours and placing them in residential neighborhoods.'' He also made this statement: ''We know where they are. They're in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad and east, west, south, and north somewhat.''

The five officials also drew selectively from individual intelligence sources. In 1995, Hussein Kamel, the Iraqi official who had been in charge of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs, defected and described how Iraq had violated U.N. resolutions in the early 1990s. Administration officials cited these claims repeatedly. For example, President Bush said: ''In 1995, after several years of deceit by the Iraqi regime, the head of Iraq's military industries defected. It was then that the regime was forced to admit that it had produced more than 30,000 liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents. . . . This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for, and capable of killing millions.''

President Bush failed to disclose, however, that this same defector reported to U.N. inspectors that Iraq had destroyed all of its chemical and biological weapons stocks.

Since the war ended, the Iraq Survey Group has reported that it is unlikely that chemical or biological stockpiles existed prior to the war. As Dr. Kay concluded: ''I'm personally convinced that there were not large stockpiles of newly produced weapons of mass destruction. We don't find the people, the documents or the physical plants that you would expect to find if the production was going on.'' Dr. Kay reported in October 2003 that ''Iraq's large-scale capability to develop, produce, and fill new CW munitions was reduced—if not entirely destroyed—during Operation Desert Storm and Desert Fox, 13 years of UN sanctions and UN inspections.''

Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet echoed these findings: ''It also appears that Iraq had the infrastructure and talent to resume production—but we have yet to

find that it actually did so, nor have we found weapons.'' His bottom line was that ''we do not know if production took place—and just as clearly—we have not yet found biological weapons.''

*2. Claims about Unmanned Aerial Vehicles*

Prior to the war, Administration officials raised the specter of Iraq using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) to distribute chemical or biological weapons directly over the United States. Although there was agreement within the intelligence community that Iraq had a UAV program, there was a sharp split over whether these UAVs were designed to deliver chemical or biological weapons. The October NIE concluded that the UAV program was ''probably'' intended to deliver biological weapons. However, the government entity most knowledgeable about UAVs and their potential applications, the Air Force's National Air and Space Intelligence Center, disagreed with this conclusion. According to the NIE, the U.S. Air Force ''does not agree that Iraq is developing UAVs primarily intended to be delivery platforms for chemical and biological (CBW) agents.'' Instead, the Air Force experts asserted that ''[t]he small size of Iraq's new UAV strongly suggests a primary role of reconnaissance.''

The five Administration officials did not acknowledge these doubts in their public statements, however. Instead, they made misleading assertions regarding the purpose of the UAVs in 5 statements in 5 public appearances.

For example, on October 7, 2002, just days before the October 10 and October 11, 2002, congressional votes on the Iraqi war resolution, President Bush claimed that ''Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical or biological weapons.'' He did not disclose that experts at the Air Force found such a use improbable. Instead, he highlighted the fear of Iraq's UAVs being used ''for missions targeting the United States.'' Such statements had an impact on members of Congress. For example, Senator Bill Nelson voted for the Iraq war resolution ''precisely because of the administration's UAV evidence.'' He explained: ''I was told not only that [Hussein had weapons of mass destruction] and that he had the means to deliver them through unmanned aerial vehicles, but that he had the capability of transporting those UAVs outside of Iraq and threatening the homeland here in America, specifically by putting them on ships off the eastern seaboard. . . . I thought there was an imminent threat.''

In his address to the United Nations, Secretary Powell asserted: ''UAVs are well suited for dispensing chemical and biological weapons. There is ample evidence that Iraq has dedicated much effort to developing and testing spray devices that could be adapted for UAVs.'' In making his presentation to the U.N., Secretary Powell showed a photo of an ''illustrative'' UAV, which he suggested was well-suited for spraying chemical or biological weapons over the United States. This presentation affected members of Congress. Senator Dianne Feinstein stated that of the various pieces of evidence presented by Secretary Powell, ''The most compelling to me was the unmanned aerial vehicle and the development of that with spray tanks. And he kind of laid down the fact that this could be in our country and there was a possibility that this might be used against the United States.''

President Bush later highlighted Secretary Powell's presentation, claiming: ''All the world has now seen the footage of an Iraqi Mirage aircraft with a fuel tank modified to spray biological agents over wide areas. . . . A UAV launched from a vessel off the American coast could reach hundreds of miles inland.''

The Iraq Survey Group found little to substantiate these claims. According to Dr. Kay's January 28, testimony, Iraq's UAV program ''was not a strong point'' because it was only ''theoretically possible'' to have ''snuck one of those on a ship off the East Coast of the United States that might have been able to deliver a small amount someplace.'' He found only that ''at least one of those families of UAVs'' was a ''descendent'' of another model that once had a ''spray tank on it.'' In his assessment, there was no ''existing deployment capability at that point for any sort of systematic military attack.''

*3. Claims about Mobile Biological Laboratories*

In April and early May 2003, military forces found mobile trailers in Iraq. Although intelligence experts disputed the purpose of the trailers, Administration officials repeatedly asserted that they were mobile biological weapons laboratories. In total, President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice made 34 misleading statements about the trailers in 27 separate public appearances.

Shortly after the trailers were found, the CIA and DIA issued an unclassified white paper evaluating the trailers. The white paper was released without coordination with other members of the intelligence community, however. It was disclosed later that engineers from DIA who examined the trailers concluded that they were most likely used to produce hydrogen for artillery weather balloons. A former senior intelligence official reported that ''only one of 15 intelligence analysts assembled from three agencies to discuss the issue in June endorsed the white paper conclusion.''

Despite these doubts within the intelligence community, the five officials repeatedly misled Congress and the public about the trailers by asserting without qualification that they were proof of Iraq's biological weapons program. President Bush made perhaps the most prominent misleading statement on this matter when he proclaimed: ''We found the weapons of mass destruction. We found biological laboratories. You remember when Colin Powell stood up in front of the world, and he said, Iraq has got laboratories, mobile labs to build biological weapons. They're illegal. They're against the United Nations resolutions, and we've so far discovered two. And we'll find more weapons as time goes on. But for those who say we haven't found the banned manufacturing devices or banned weapons, they're wrong, we found them.''

Similarly, Secretary Powell's comments about the trailers frequently asserted with certainty that the trailers were biological weapons laboratories. For example:

On May 21, 2003, Secretary Powell said: ''The intelligence community has really looked hard at these vans, and we can find no other purpose for them. Although you can't find actual germs on them, they have been cleaned and we don't know whether they have been used for that purpose or not, but they were certainly designed and constructed for that purpose. And we have taken our time on this one because we wanted to make sure we got it right. And the intelligence community, I think, is convinced now that that's the purpose they served.''

On May 22, 2003, Secretary Powell said, ''So far, we have found the biological weapons vans that I spoke about when I presented the case to the United Nations on the 5th of February, and there is no doubt in our minds now that those vans were designed for only one purpose, and that was to make biological weapons.''

The doubts about the trailers were confirmed by the work of the Iraq Survey Group. According to Dr. Kay's January 28, 2004, testimony, ''the consensus opinion is that when you look at those two trailers, while [they] had capabilities in many areas, their actual intended use was not for the production of biological weapons.'' In a separate interview, Dr. Kay explained that the trailers ''were actually designed to produce hydrogen for weather balloons, or perhaps to produce rocket fuel.''

D. STATEMENTS ABOUT IRAQ'S SUPPORT OF AL QAEDA

Another key component of the case for going to war against Iraq was the claim that Iraq was supporting al Qaeda. As was the case with other featured claims the al Qaeda claims were disputed by intelligence officials within the Administration. Yet President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice regularly failed to acknowledge these doubts or the weaknesses in the case linking Iraq and al Qaeda. They made 61 misleading statements about the strength of the Iraq-al Qaeda alliance in 52 public appearances.

Well before the war of Iraq, the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate made clear that the U.S. intelligence community had serious doubts about the threat of Iraq arming al Qaeda. In its section on ''Confidence Levels for Selected Key Judgements in This Estimate,'' the NIE gave a ''Low Confidence'' rating to the notion of ''Whether in desperation Saddam would share chemical or biological weapons with Al Qa'ida.'' The discussion of this possibility in the NIE contained highly qualified language: ''Saddam, if sufficiently desperate, might decide that only an organization such as al Qa'ida . . . could perpetuate the type of terrorist attack that he would hope to conduct.'' The NIE also reported that ''Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or CBW against the United States, fearing that exposure of Iraqi involvement would provide Washington a stronger cause for making war.''

Director of Central Intelligence Tenet stated in an October 2002 letter that there were intelligence reports of contacts between al Qaeda and Iraq. At the same time, however, he asserted clear qualifiers for this information: ''Our understanding of the relationship between Iraq and al- Qa'ida is evolving and is based on sources of varying reliability.'' Senators who were briefed by intelligence officials in the fall of 2002 expressed skepticism about the significance of the link. For example, Senator JEFFORDS on October 8, 2002, stated, ''While there is talk of cooperation between Iraq and al-Qaeda, and I don't doubt that there has been some cooperation, I have not seen any hard evidence of close cooperation.'' According to another account, Sen. Richard J. Durbin . . . said some classified information he had seen did not support the administration's portrayal of the Iraqi threat. ''It's troubling to have classified information that contradicts statements made by the administration,'' Durbin said. ''There's more they should share with the public.'' Durbin would not be more specific, but he did say the committee had received the views of some analysts who do not share the administration's conclusion that Iraq was an urgent threat with important links to al-Qaeda terrorists.

Journalists also reported that many intelligence officials within the Administration doubted the significance of reported contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda. According to one report: ''[A]nalysts at the C.I.A. . . . believed that the evidence showed some contacts between Baghdad and the terrorist organization, but not an operational alliance. . . . [A]t the C.I.A., many analysts believed that

Mr. bin Laden saw Mr. Hussein as one of the corrupt secular Arab leaders who should be toppled.''

Despite the doubts of many intelligence analysts, the five Administration officials regularly asserted that there was a close relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. For example:

In a November 7, 2002, speech, President Bush stated: Saddam Hussein is ''a threat because he is dealing with al Qaeda. . . . [A] true threat facing our country is that an Al Qaeda-type network trained and armed by Saddam could attack America and not leave one fingerprint.''

In his January 28, 2003, State of the Union address, President Bush stated: ''Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda. Secretly, and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists, or help them develop their own.''

In his February 5, 2003, remarks to the United Nations, Secretary of State Colin Powell stated: ''what I want to bring to your attention today is the potentially much more sinister nexus between Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist network, a nexus that combines classic terrorist organizations and modern methods of murder. Iraq today harbors a deadly terrorist network headed by Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, an associate and collaborator of Usama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda lieutenants.''

In his remarks on May 1, 2003, announcing the end of major combat operations in Iraq, President Bush stated: ''The battle of Iraq is one victory in a war on terror that began on September the 11, 2001—and still goes on. . . . [T]he liberation of Iraq . . . removed an ally of al Qaeda.''

Vice President Cheney's statements on this topic repeatedly cited reports of a specific alleged Iraq–al Qaeda contact: A meeting between Mohammed Atta, one of the September 11 hijackers, and a senior Iraqi official in Prague a few months before September 11, 2001. For example, Vice President Cheney stated on September 14, 2003: ''With respect to 9/11, of course, we've had the story that's been public out there. The Czechs alleged that Mohammed Atta, the lead attacker, met in Prague with a senior Iraqi intelligence official five months before the attack, but we've never been able to develop any more of that yet either in terms of confirming it or discrediting it. We just don't know.''

The Vice President's assertions about this meeting omitted key information. He did not acknowledge that the CIA and FBI had concluded before the war in Iraq that ''the meeting probably did not take place''; and Czech government officials had developed doubts regarding whether this meeting occurred; or that American records indicate that Mr. Atta was in Virginia Beach, Virginia, at the time of the purported meeting.

Assessments following the war further highlighted the tenuous nature of the Administration's assertions about an Iraq–al Qaeda alliance. According to the New York Times, ''Since American forces toppled the Hussein government and the United States gained access to captured Iraqi officials and Iraqi files, the C.I.A. has not yet uncovered evidence that has altered its prewar assessment concerning the connections between Mr. Hussein and Osama bin Laden, the leader of al Qaeda, officials said.''

Consistent with this view, during Dr. Kay's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 28, 2004, the following exchange occurred between Senator Warner and Dr. Kay. Senator Warner: Any evidence with regard to participation by either Saddam Hussein or his principal henchmen in the WMD-sharing with al Qaeda or any other terrorist organizations? Dr. Kay: Senator Levin—Senator Warner, there is no evidence that I can think of that I know of.

## V. MISLEADING STATEMENTS BY INDIVIDUAL OFFICIALS

### A. PRESIDENT BUSH

President Bush made 55 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 27 separate public statements or appearances.

Of the 55 misleading statements by President Bush, 4 claimed that Iraq posed an urgent threat; 14 exaggerated Iraq's efforts to develop nuclear weapons; 18 overstated Iraq's chemical or biological weapons capacity; and 19 misrepresented Iraq's links to al Qaeda.

On October 7, 2002, just days before the October 10 and October 11, 2002 congressional votes on the Iraq war resolution, President Bush gave an address in Cincinnati, Ohio, about the threat posed by Iraq. In this speech, President Bush made 11 misleading statements about Iraq, the highest number of misleading statements in any single appearance by any of the five officials. In this single appearance, President Bush made misleading statements about Iraq's nuclear capabilities, Iraq's efforts to procure aluminum tubes, Iraq's chemical and biological capabilities, and Iraq's connection to al Qaeda.

Some of the misleading statements made by President Bush included the following: ''On its present course, the Iraqi regime is a threat of unique urgency. . . . It has developed weapons of mass death.'' ''The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.'' ''The liberation of Iraq . . . removed an ally of al Qaeda.'' ''We found the weapons of mass destruction. . . . [F]or those who say we haven't found the banned manufacturing devices or banned weapons, they're wrong, we found them.''

### B. VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY

Vice President Cheney made 51 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 25 separate public statements or appearances.

Of the 51 misleading statements by Vice President Cheney, 1 claimed that Iraq posed an urgent threat; 22 exaggerated Iraq's efforts to develop nuclear weapons; 7 overstated Iraq's chemical or biological weapons capacity; and 21 misrepresented Iraq's links to al Qaeda.

Some of the misleading statements made by Vice President Cheney included the following: ''[W]e do know, with absolute certainty, that he is using his procurement system to acquire the equipment he needs in order to enrich uranium to build a nuclear weapon.'' Saddam Hussein ''had an established relationship with al Qaeda.'' ''[W]e believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons.''

### C. SECRETARY RUMSFELD

Secretary Rumsfeld made 52 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 23 separate public statements or appearances.

Of the 52 misleading statements by Secretary Rumsfeld; 5 claimed that Iraq posed an urgent threat; 18 exaggerated Iraq's efforts to develop nuclear weapons; 21 overstated Iraq's chemical or biological weapons capacity; and 8 misrepresented Iraq's links to al Qaeda.

Some of the misleading statements made by Secretary Rumsfeld included the following:

''Now transport yourself forward a year, two years, or a week, or a month, and if Saddam Hussein were to take his weapons of mass destruction and transfer them, either use himself, or transfer them to the Al-Qaeda, and somehow the Al-Qaeda were to engage in an attack on the United States . . . with a weapon of mass destruction you're now talking about 300, or 3,000 people potentially being killed, but 30,000, or 100,000 . . . human beings.''

''[Saddam Hussein's] regime . . . recently was discovered seeking significant quantities of uranium from Africa.''

''We said they had a nuclear program. That was never any debate.''

### D. SECRETARY POWELL

Secretary Powell made 50 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 34 separate public statements or appearances.

Of the 50 misleading statements by Secretary Powell, 1 claimed that Iraq posed an urgent threat; 10 exaggerated Iraq's efforts to develop nuclear weapons; 32 overstated Iraq's chemical or biological weapons capacity; and 7 misrepresented Iraq's links to al Qaeda.

Sometimes Secretary Powell used caveats and qualifying language in his public statements. For example, on March 9, 2003, he said, ''Well with respect to the aluminum tubes, we still believe the case is out. The CIA has done a great deal of analysis on those tubes. They are not persuaded they were just for rockets. And, in fact, another nation this week, a European nation, came forward with some additional information that still, I think, leaves it an open question as to what the purpose of those tubes was.'' Secretary Powell's acknowledgement of differences in this example was not an unqualified statement that only mentioned one side of an intelligence debate.

On numerous other occasions, however, Secretary Powell made unconditional statements about the threats posed by Iraq without disclosing the doubts of intelligence officials. Some of the misleading statements he made included the following:

''Iraq is now concentrating . . . on developing and testing smaller UAVs. . . . UAVs are well suited for dispensing chemical and biological weapons.''

''The more we wait, the more chance there is for this dictator with clear ties to terrorist groups, including al-Qaida, more time for him to pass a weapon, share a technology, or use these weapons again.''

''So far, we have found the biological weapons vans that I spoke about when I presented the case to the United Nations on the 5th of February, and there is no doubt in our minds that those vans were designed for only one purpose, and that was to make biological weapons.''

### E. NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR RICE

Ms. Rice made 29 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 16 separate public statements or appearances.

Of the 29 misleading statements by Ms. Rice, 17 concerned Iraq's efforts to develop nuclear weapons; 6 overstated Iraq's chemical or biological weapons capacity; and 6 misrepresented Iraq's links to al Qaeda.

Some of the misleading statements made by Ms. Rice included the following:

''We do know that [Saddam Hussein] is actively pursuing a nuclear weapon.''

''We do know that there have been shipments going into . . . Iraq, for instance, of aluminum tubes that really are only suited to—high quality aluminum tools that are only really suited for nuclear weapons programs, centrifuge programs.''

''[T]he declaration fails to account for or explain Iraq's efforts to get uranium from abroad.''

Ms. Rice made significantly more statements that were false—8—than any of the other four officials. Many of these statements came in June and July 2003 when questions were being raised about why President

Bush asserted in his State of the Union address that Iraq was seeking to import uranium from Africa. Ms. Rice repeatedly stated during this period that no one in the White House was informed of the doubts about this uranium claim. For example, she stated:

''We did not know at the time—no one knew at the time, in our circles—maybe someone knew down in the bowels of the agency, but no one in our circles knew that there were doubts and suspicions that this might be a forgery.''

''[H]ad there been even a peep that the agency did not want that sentence in or that George Tenet did not want that sentence in, that the director of Central Intelligence did not want it in, it would have been gone.''

These statements were simply false. As explained above, the CIA had repeatedly communicated its objections to White House officials, including Ms. Rice.

VI. CONCLUSION

Because of the gravity of the subject and the President's unique access to classified information, members of Congress and the public expect the President and his senior officials to take special care to be balanced and accurate in describing national security threats. It does not appear, however, that President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Advisor Rice met this standard in the case of Iraq. To the contrary, these five officials repeatedly made misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq. In 125 separate appearances, they made 11 misleading statements about the urgency of Iraq's threat, 81 misleading statements about Iraq's nuclear activities, 84 misleading statements about Iraq's chemical and biological capabilities, and 61 misleading statements about Iraq's relationship with al Qaeda.

Some of the categories of the misleading statements: A, a statement that Iraq posed an urgent threat; B, statements about Iraq's nuclear capabilities, including the claims about the status of the Iraqi nuclear program; the claims about the aluminum tubes; the claims about uranium from Africa.

Then there is another category, statements about Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs, claims about chemical and biological weapons, about unmanned aerial vehicles, about mobile biological laboratories; and then there is a special part in this study about Iraq's statements about Iraq's support of al Qaeda.

Then just to be fair to the four other members in the White House that work on these matters, there are misleading statements by individual officials. The first official is the President of the United States. The second official is the Vice President of the United States. The third official is the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. The fourth category is the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, and the fifth category is reserved for the National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice.

I recommend these items and this study to each and every Member of the House; and I would be happy to discuss it, along with the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, with any of the Members of the Congress on or off the record.

HAITI

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I turn now to a subject that I consider to be very important, and that is, Haiti, a beleaguered tiny nation in the western hemisphere that has been subject to a succession of activities that have caused President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, his wife, and children to flee from the country.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the vice chair of the Progressive Caucus, who has introduced a truth bill to discover and uncover the truth about Haiti. It is a bill that would establish an independent commission and has been cosponsored by more than two dozen other Members, in which she calls for in this measure that we create an independent commission to investigate the circumstances that surround a democratically elected president being forcibly driven from his office and forced to leave the country, which is, incidentally, the second time this has happened during the election of President Aristide.

□ 2030

This last time raises some quite ambiguous questions that we need to resolve. Did the United States Government impede democracy and in any way contribute to the overthrow of the Aristide government? What were the circumstances that the President issued a resignation? To what extent did the United States impede efforts by the international community to prevent the overthrow of the democratically elected Government of Haiti? What was the role of the United States in influencing decisions regarding Haiti at the United Nations Security Council in discussions between Haiti and other countries that were apparently willing to assist in the preservation of the democratically elected Government of Haiti by sending security forces there? Was our assistance provided or were U.S. personnel involved in supporting indirectly the forces opposed to the President of Haiti? And, finally, was there bilateral assistance from the United States channeled through nongovernmental organizations that were directly or indirectly associated with political groups actively involved in creating hostilities, and in some instances violence, toward the government of President Aristide and citizens who supported the President of that country?

And so we have referred that House Resolution 2625 to the appropriate Committee on Government Reform to be acted upon. We think this is a very important, very timely activity, and we are hoping that there can be a perfectly candid impartial commission formed to study these vexing questions that have been propounded in the proposal of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

## THE TRAGEDY IN SPAIN AND HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I too want to touch on a variety of subjects tonight. There are so many things that are before this body and before the country, and I think it is important to speak out about a number of them.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, that is on my mind, of course, is the terrible tragedy that happened in Spain last week. And in the sad aftermath of the bombings in Madrid, unfortunately we see coming from that some sort of new strategy to deal with the war on terror and it is a most unwelcome strategy. This is a strategy of capitulation and of compromise. It is a strategy, in short, of surrender. In that surrender, what do we give up? We give up security, we give up our beliefs, and we give up our values.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to say that ''Appeasement does not bring peace.'' Just ask Neville Chamberlain. ''Compromise with hate will not work.'' Remember Joseph Stalin?

Mr. Speaker, these terrorists are not seeking peace. They seek to terrorize. Their desire is to bring ruin and disruption into people's lives. They want control, but we must stand firm.

The war on terrorism was brought to this country in September of 2001. Our President, George Bush, responded to that act of war in an address to this House with these wise words: ''The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quiet unyielding anger. These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our Nation into chaos and retreat, but they have failed. Our country is strong. A great people has been moved to defend a great Nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundation of our largest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve. America was targeted for attack because we are the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world, and no one will keep that light from shining.'' President George Bush, September 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I, like everyone else in this House, was greatly saddened by the attacks in Spain. It is a mournful time for the people of Spain and for all of Europe as they bury their dead. But in the midst of this sorrow a more menacing problem is evolving. People are blaming the war on terrorism for causing the attack, and using this as a reason to vote out a strong ally in this war. In fact, I would remind the Speaker that Prime Minister Aznar was in this House and spoke to the House and Senate just a scant 5 weeks ago and received standing ovation after standing ovation in this House at the time he delivered his address.

In voting out the strong ally in the war on terror, the people of Spain have

actually handed over their government that will now shrink in the face of terrorism. The Spanish voters have handed to the terrorists their largest victory to date. No doubt the terrorists will feel emboldened. They feel victorious. They were able to cause chaos and disrupt an entire government. Is this the signal we wish to send the terrorists? Is this the type of behavior that we would seek to reward?

Quoting an editorial today in The Washington Post; ''The rash response by Jose Rodriguez Zapatero, Prime Minister Elect, will probably convince the extremists that they are able to sway Spanish policy with mass murder, and they succeeded brilliantly.''

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, we are winning this war. And, in fact, an article from my hometown paper, the Dallas Morning News, today stated, ''The Prime Minister of the Netherlands found that it was important in the international community that we stand shoulder to shoulder and show solidarity to fight against these terrible attacks. We share that same goal.''

Mr. Speaker, last month, I was in Pakistan with part of a congressional delegation of the Committee on Government Reform and President Pervez Musharraf spoke to our group. Speaking to Members of Congress, he said, and I quote, ''The United States and this administration represents truly the last best chance for peace in this troubled region.'' Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Both Iraq and Afghanistan have been freed from brutal totalitarian regimes. Both countries are now functioning under their interim constitutions, and both will soon hold free elections. America is winning the war on terrorism. This is no time for our resolve to weaken. This is no time for the leaders, or those who would be leaders on our national stage, to exhibit capitulation with the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about health care on the floor of the House tonight, and I feel obligated to speak to that as well. Some of the comments that were just offered by the gentleman from Michigan particularly deserve and, in fact, demand a response. His vision for the country being under a single-payer, government-run system is one that, quite frankly, causes me to shudder. I cannot imagine giving up that degree of control over my life or my family's life to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think back to a time last summer when I was visiting in Iraq and got to see their health care system. They have been under a single-payer, government-run system for 20 or 30 years, and the state of their health care system was below pitiful. So that does not seem to me to be a valid solution to health care in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we passed some pretty major health care legislation back at the end of last year, in November, H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act. On December 8, 2003, our President, George W. Bush, signed into law H.R. 1. This bill will institute sweeping new changes into the Medicare program, extending prescription drug coverage for the first time ever, and improving the program in ways that will make America's health care system healthier, stronger, and happier.

The United States House of Representatives approved H.R. 1 November 22, 2003. The vote was 220 to 215. The United States Senate approved the bill by a vote of 54–44 on November 25, 2003. When the bill came before the United States House of Representatives for a vote, I, along with 220 Members of the House, voted in favor of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, we all know no bill is perfect, but there were several important provisions included in the bill that will dramatically improve the Medicare program and seniors' health. And just as importantly, as we have also heard tonight from the gentleman from New Hampshire, there were other provisions in this bill that will improve health care in general for generations to come.

In regards to immediate assistance. Starting this summer, seniors will have access to a Medicare drug discount card that will provide discounts of up to 25 percent of their drug costs. Low-income seniors will have additional assistance through the discount card program, having an additional $600 annual supplemental along with their discount cards.

The Medicare prescription drug coverage. For the first time since the creation of the Medicare program, prescription drug coverage will be available to all seniors covered by the program. Under the program, which will go into effect in the year 2006, a majority of seniors will see dramatic reductions in their drug spending. For a $35 monthly premium and a $250 annual deduction, Medicare will pay 75 percent of the prescription drug costs up to $2,250. Seniors are responsible for costs between $2,251 up to $3,600. When annual drug spending reaches $3,600 a year, Medicare pays 95 percent of all drug costs after that point. Low-income seniors will be covered by an even more extensive drug benefit with little or no cost-sharing on the part of the beneficiary and total coverage for all yearly drug costs.

The bill itself has several provisions that will speed market entry of cheaper generic drugs. Key reforms to the Hatch-Waxman Act, the Federal law governing generic drug introduction, will provide brand name manufacturers only one 30-day stay for generic production once the patent expires.

Another way the bill establishes for realistic market controls to drug pricing is by reforming the average wholesale price structure. This price structure is reported by drug manufacturers and rarely has any relation to what physicians actually pay for drugs. Without reform, overpayment, due to the average wholesale price, could reach into millions of dollars.

Protecting retiree health benefit plans. A major concern of mine as Congress considered this bill is how it would treat retiree health plans. Several of my constituents expressed their deep concerns that with the creation of a new Medicare benefit that their company would drop their retiree health plan. I shared their concern, and I worked with the conference committee members to ensure that the bill did protect retiree health plans.

The bill will support 28 percent of a retiree's drug costs between $250 and $5,000. That is equal to nearly two-thirds of the actuarial value of the standard benefit. The subsidy is also excludable from tax indication, raising its total value in the bill by $18 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we heard a little earlier about health savings accounts. H.R. 1 creates new accounts that allows individuals and families to accumulate tax-free assets devoted to their health needs. The accounts will allow workers under the age of 65 to accumulate tax-free savings for lifetime health care needs if they have a qualified health plan. Health savings accounts require qualified plans that have a minimum deductible of $1,000, with a $5,000 cap on yearly out-of-pocket expenses.

These amounts are doubled for family policies. Individuals can make pretax contributions of up to 100 percent of the health plan deductible. The maximum annual contribution is $2,600 for individuals and $5,150 for families, indexed annually for inflation.

□ 2045

Pretax contributions can be made by individuals, their employers and family members. Individuals ages 55 to 65 can make additional pretax catch-up contributions not covered by the insurance policy. Tax-free distributions can be made for continuation coverage periods by Federal law such as COBRA payments, health care insurance for the unemployed, and long-term care insurance.

Health savings accounts will change the face of health care coverage in the United States. The individual owns the account. The savings follow the individual from job to job into retirement. The flexibility and asset accumulation characteristics of these accounts will help millions of Americans save for their health needs. Health savings accounts will also encourage individuals to buy health plans that better suit their needs so insurance kicks in only when it is truly needed. Moreover, individuals will make cost-conscious decisions if they are spending their own money rather than someone else's money.

One of the major problems facing the Medicare program is the low rate at which it reimburses doctors for their services. As the Medicare program has cut rates, some physicians have stopped providing treatments to Medicare patients. This reduction in access

to a wide range of physicians could have a detrimental impact on many seniors. In order to maintain adequate physician participation in the Medicare program, H.R. 1 rescinds a cut in physician payments and increases payments over the next 2 years. All physicians and providers, such as physician assistants, nurse practitioners, occupational therapists and other providers paid under the Medicare physician fee schedule will see a 1.5 percent payment rate increase under the House bill instead of the 4.5 percent payment cut in 2004. This produces a net increase of nearly 6 percent in payment rates in the year 2004.

An additional 1.5 percent increase will replace another projected cut in 2005. To address the volatility in physician payment updates over time, the bill changes the formula used to calculate payments by using a 10-year rolling average measure instead of the current single year measure. H.R. 1 addresses the scarcity of physicians in rural areas of the country. To help rural and other areas with few physicians with recruitment and retention, Medicare will pay a 5 percent bonus to physicians providing care in scarcity areas in 2005 through 2007. Both primary care doctors and specialists would be eligible for this bonus if they provide care in scarcity areas.

Mr. Speaker, a question that I am often asked about the Medicare bill is, why? Why did you undertake such a big, sweeping change to Medicare?

One of the first things I need to say is all of the changes that were implemented in H.R. 1 are entirely voluntary, that is, if someone in the system likes what they have in the Medicare system, they do not have to change. They do not need to purchase a prescription drug benefit; they certainly do not need to avail themselves of any other of the other benefits, such as health savings accounts, that are available in the Medicare bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, from 1965 when Medicare was first enacted in this country, there was something missing from the program and what was missing was prescription drug coverage. In 1965, it may not have mattered as much. The major expenses that a senior faced back then from the medical system was either undergoing an operation or prolonged hospitalization for, say, treatment of pneumonia. Prescription drugs were few and far between. There was only penicillin and cortisone, and those were interchangeable back then. But a lot has changed since 1965. In the 21st century, we have an enormous pharmaceutical capability that was really unimagined 38 years ago when Medicare was brought into being.

Mr. Speaker, it was crucial that this gap be addressed. We are spending $287 billion a year on the Medicare program this year without considering prescription drugs. We are spending a tremendous amount of money and are scheduled to spend a tremendous amount of money year in and year out on Medicare, and we are not getting value for our dollar.

As my colleague from New Hampshire pointed out earlier, earlier treatment of disease can reduce the overall cost for treating an episode of disease.

Finally, we have heard a lot in regards to the cost of the Medicare bill and the cost of the prescription drug benefit. Over 10 years' time, $395 billion was the estimate from the Congressional Budget Office, and more recently the White House Office of Management and Budget came out with a figure of $535 billion over 10 years, or numbers to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out there are some areas for cost savings within Medicare. We had before this House about a year ago this week a bill H.R. 5, which would have reformed the medical liability system in this country. The House passed it. Unfortunately, the legislation has stalled on the other side of the Capitol. I have great hopes that someday it will move, but it is not on the horizon right now.

By reforming the medical liability system in this country and undoing some of the effects of the cost of defensive medicine, not just the cost people pay for insurance premiums, but the cost of defensive medicine, could reap enormous benefits. There was a study done in Stanford, California, in 1996 that showed within the Medicare system, just in the Medicare system, the cost of defensive medicine added $50 billion a year to the cost of Medicare in this country.

There is our prescription drug benefit. No matter whose figures we use, the Congressional Budget Office or the OMB, it is $50 billion in 1996 dollars each year savings from removing the cost of defensive medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. This subject of exactly why we did take up the Medicare and prescription drug bill comes up frequently, and it is a question that people really do concern themselves with.

For me as a business owner, when I came to this body and looked at the budget and realized that almost all economists agreed that within 4 to 10 years Medicare would put such deep stress on the budget, we may not have solutions to it.

As a business owner, if I see that kind of problem 5 to 10 years down the road, I know I must do something today to begin to defuse the demand, defuse the problem well before it arrives.

As we began to develop the program, the Medicare prescription drug bill, I began to ask questions and to make requests of my own. One of the things that several Members did was sign a letter saying if you do not give equal reimbursement to the rural areas, we will not vote for any bill.

Mr. Speaker, I campaigned saying we should treat the rural areas of America fairly, that they needed to be compensated the same way because that is not the case in the past. We got 100 percent equality for rural hospitals in this bill, and it is one thing that affects my district tremendously. It was not just affordability of care that was at stake in my district; it was the access to care, even having hospitals that would operate and be in the district, and so this one component of equalizing the reimbursement rate in our rural hospitals was key.

Another element that caused me to think there were good elements of the bill and it deserved support was the way border hospitals are treated. Border hospitals have a mandate by the immigration service that if an immigrant comes to a hospital with a medical problem, that hospital at its own expense or the expense of the county in which it is located, will transfer the person to the nearest facility where treatment can be given. Hospitals in my district are severely burdened. My district is on the border of Mexico, and the hospitals complain about the unfunded mandates to transport and to treat many medical conditions. Then the immigrants are taken back to the border and deposited there to return to their homes.

Mr. Speaker, that was another element that I campaigned on saying that we should get reimbursement for those costs mandated by the Federal Government. In this bill there is $1 billion to begin to help border hospitals pay for the costs that they face through an unfunded mandate by the Federal Government in the immigration department.

Those two things really began to convince me that for rural New Mexico, the Medicare bill had a good beginning, but it did not stop there. The disproportionate share hospitals also received an increase in funding level. Again, that affects most of the hospitals in my district. We also dealt with the reimbursement for rural physicians in this bill. Again, a win for New Mexico. So it began to look to me like we had the elements to build a successful bill on, that we had some long-term cures that were a long time in coming, and I was proud to be a part of those.

As we got into the philosophy of the bill, I think that is where we really began to see the need for change, the need for systemic change. One example of how we do things upside down in Medicare and in providing government coverage for Medicare is that we cause incentives to go to the most high-priced objective. We all know that for a small copay you can get any pharmaceutical that you would like to have. Once you reach the copay, you might as well get the expensive as the generic because there is no difference.

If we turned the incentive upside down and were to provide coverage for the generic, and if you want then the expensive version of the same drug,

you would have to provide the difference, that was a compelling way to me that we could change behavior and change buying patterns throughout the country.

One of the things that we did in this bill was we began to limit the powers of the drug companies. I appreciate what the pharmaceutical companies have done in this country. They have created pharmaceuticals that are extending lives beyond belief. The fastest population group in America is over 100 years old. The second fastest growing age group is 85 to 100. These extensions of life and the quality of life that is experienced is because of the good work that the pharmaceutical companies do; but the pharmaceutical companies are just like the rest of us. They will take advantage when advantage given.

There was a practice of extending patents indefinitely. At the end of the patent period, they would change a few words and change the patent again. It was legal, but it was something which many felt was not right. In this bill, we limited the extensions to one. You get your original patent period, and then one extension. That will bring generic drugs to the market sooner. Just to make sure that the generic drugs come to the market sooner and we get competition sooner, we went ahead and put provisions in that would encourage the generics to be brought to market sooner.

We just wanted the drug companies to know that we appreciate what they do, but we also wanted to give them a small wake-up call that there were practices that we felt like were not in the best interest of all Americans. And so those changes were made here. Again, a very positive component that I felt began to justify this particular bill to be voted for.

Another thing that we did were health savings accounts. My colleagues have talked about that tonight, but I will give my brief summary. Health savings accounts are really medical IRAs. Americans can put in money tax free at any age, and at any age you can take money out tax free. That makes the health dollar worth 30 to 40 percent more, depending where you are in the income spectrum.

So you have a medical IRA that you put money into tax free at any age, about $5,000 a year, and you can take money out at any age if you use it to pay for medical benefits. You can pay for your premiums out of this health savings account; you can pay for your deductibles out of the health savings accounts, as well as prescription drugs or any other medical expense.

The nice thing about health savings accounts are they are a part of your estate. If you do not use it for your medical needs, you are able to pass it on to the next generation and to the next generation so that your children and grandchildren have a head start on paying for their medical needs.

I will tell Members, as a small business owner, the way that I would have dealt with this, and my wife and I sold our business in October of last year so I no longer have employees that would qualify for this, but the way I would deal with this particular situation is I would begin to give pay and bonuses into that account. So instead of giving pay increases, I would pay the increase into the health savings account. I would try to put $5,000 a year for every employee into the account, where the money was worth 30 to 40 percent more, and also where they could begin to use it to pay out of an account that has been put into their name, and they can pay out of that account to pay for premiums and deductibles.

I think as we build the size of the account, we can all see that we can begin to shop for higher deductible insurance. Right now most of the time when I shopped for health insurance, it was either a $500 or $1,000 deductible. But if a small business has helped pay in $5,000 to $20,000 into a health savings account, and knows that no one is going to be disadvantaged, then we begin to shop for maybe $5,000 deductibles. It is at that point the health insurance costs begin to collapse tremendously and we put the health care, the health insurance costs back within the reach of the average wage earner.

□ 2100

Ten percent of my employees had insurance costs of more than $1,000 a month. With 20 and 30 percent increases, you could look at 3 years from now having $2,000 a month. There is a point, Mr. Speaker, at which no one can afford health insurance. The health savings account, this medical IRA, begins to change the way that we think about health insurance. It begins to change buying patterns so that long term we begin to affect the price of medical services themselves. One of the most important things that we did in this bill is began to understand that if we will catch problems at the front, at their initiation, they are far easier and cheaper to take care of.

One of the reasons that Medicare has been so expensive, one of the reasons it stands to break the budget of the United States, is that we have no preventive medicine. At least we did not until we passed this bill. In other words, we would not do screenings but Medicare would pay for the full cost of operations, heart surgeries, cancer treatments after they were full-blown.

In this bill with screenings, physical exams and preventive medicines guaranteed, I think that we are going to begin to collapse the cost of this Medicare bill overall down below what it has been, rather than the astronomical increases that we are seeing projected; because I think, as the good doctor has pointed out, that there are applications in this bill which will save us money, not cost us money.

The gentleman from Texas explained adequately that the benefit programs were one of the main questions that he faces in his district. Benefit programs are a concern to all of us. Many companies have employees who have retired and are using that company benefit for their health insurance. I have experienced the same concerns in my district that the gentleman from Texas has experienced, of people wondering, well, if you put this in place, then my company is going to drop it, they are going to drop the coverage that I currently have. That disappointed them. It concerned them.

I will tell you that we did something in this bill that to me made sense. We have our opponents, those people who want to criticize the bill, saying that we are giving corporate welfare. Mr. Speaker, what they are talking about is that we are giving an incentive, we are helping these companies that pay retirees' health benefits, we are giving those companies incentives to keep the benefits in place. We are saying that if the Federal Government can pay 20 or 25 percent and cause them to keep that health benefit in place for the retirees, that that is going to be far preferable to having the company drop the coverage and having Medicare pick up 100 percent of the coverage. And so those opponents of this bill who claim that it is corporate welfare can do so; but when they do so, they have to not be telling the full truth that we did it in order to encourage companies to keep those benefit plans open for retirees who really think they have got good plans.

One of the most important parts of this bill, Mr. Speaker, was the concept of choice, the ability to choose whether you like the current plan you are under, the traditional Medicare, or whether you want to opt out and move into the new plans that will be offered as competing plans for this program.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see anyone complaining about the right to choose. I see a lot of people complaining about the potential of being mandated to move into a complete private sector but not one person has said, don't give me a choice. I will tell you that the right to choose is one of the most fundamental parts of our American society and I am proud that in this bill we have given our seniors the right to stay where they are, to use Medicare completely as it is without any changes, but we have also given them a right to choose a different kind of coverage that meets their needs more.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons that I voted for this bill but the main ones were I believe that systemically it began to address the long-term changes that are necessary to make Medicare viable for the rest of this generation, for the next generation and the generations beyond. Access to affordable health care in rural parts of the country just cemented my belief that we have done very good work in this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have more things to say but I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Texas and let him

continue and I will wait for the next coverage that he gives to me.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico. We heard earlier this evening the gentleman from Michigan stand up and talk about paying for health care. Mr. Speaker, an op-ed piece by Ronald Brownstein out in Los Angeles, California in December talked about that he thought there were only two ways to pay for health care in this country: One was an employer-given indemnity insurance plan and the other is a government-paid system. As a longtime participant in the health care field, there is a certain segment of health care that is delivered free of charge. It is uncompensated because someone either cannot pay or will not pay, and the bill therefore is uncompensated and the hospital or physician or provider simply eats that charge, and that goes on every day of the week.

But there is a fourth source and that is, of course, the individual who is going to write a check themselves, going to pay for their care themselves out of pocket. One of the problems in the world nowadays is that medical care has become so expensive so many people find that daunting, but that is why the health savings accounts not just for seniors but started at an early age and really making them available to all Americans, that is why that is such a crucial part of the overall reform encompassed within the Medicare bill.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan also referenced the newspaper Roll Call. We are all familiar with Roll Call up here on the Hill. Certainly the writers in Roll Call are no particular friend of the President of the United States. In fact, sometimes they are quite critical of him. On one of those occasions where the gentleman that writes the column Pennsylvania Avenue was very critical of the President was right after the State of the Union address, I believe it was the Monday following the President's State of the Union address, where in this House he addressed both Houses of Congress and said that he appreciated what we had done with health savings accounts, he wanted now to extend that, he wanted there to be full deductibility for a so-called catastrophic medical insurance policy, that a person would be able to deduct the cost of that from their income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, combining the power of the HSA with full deductibility of catastrophic coverage pretty much removes from consideration, that is, anyone who pays insurance in this country would no longer have an excuse for not having health insurance. We would have given them every reason to spend those tax-deferred dollars on the insurance coverage that they need.

One of the other programs that the President talked about that night, and I think the gentleman from Michigan also referenced this, was association health plans. Association health plans are a critical tool that allows small businesses of a similar business model to band together across State lines if necessary and get the purchasing power of a larger corporation, an idea that has a lot of common sense to it. An organization such as a collection of chambers of commerce, for example, or a collection of realtors, for example, these would be businesses of a similar business model, they could group together; a group of realtors could go in together and get more purchasing power with the money they use to buy health insurance policies and extend coverage and keep people from dropping out of providing insurance coverage to their employees, one of the problems that the gentleman from Michigan referenced.

Association health plans were again passed in this House in June of last year and again that is an example of some legislation that sort of stalled on the other side of the Capitol Building. I hope that it will get taken up at some point.

There is another measure, Mr. Speaker. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), my next door neighbor in Fort Worth, has a bill to provide tax credits for the uninsured. You may say, gosh, that is great. Somebody who pays income taxes can now afford health insurance. But what about someone who does not make enough money to pay income taxes? What are they going to do for insurance? This would be a prefundable tax credit, available to someone at the beginning of the year to use for the purchase of a health insurance policy.

Mr. Speaker, the combination of these three things, the health savings accounts with the inclusion of the catastrophic policy, with full deductibility of a catastrophic policy, association health plans and tax credits for the uninsured, comprise a fairly significant number of the uninsured who can be taken off the rolls of the uninsured.

Mr. Kondracke was kind of critical of the President after those three proposals were sort of wrapped together in the State of the Union address. Mr. Kondracke said, gosh, that will only cover a quarter of the people who are uninsured in this country. Mr. Speaker, that is 10 million people, in excess of 10 million people. I submit if we have the power in our hands, without any heavy lifting, to provide coverage to 10 million uninsured by the end of this year without increasing the deficit, for heaven's sake that is something we should do. There should be a moral imperative for us to take up and pass that legislation.

I urge other Members of this body to look favorably on tax credits for the uninsured when that legislation comes forward. I would encourage the Committee on Ways and Means to let that be reported out of committee and come to this House for a vote. Again, good legislation that has stalled at the other end of the Capitol needs to see the light of day.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again my condolences to the people in Spain. I want to finish up tonight by yielding back the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New Mexico and thank him for his participation in this hour of debate this evening.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, if I could request how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The Chair advises that there are 24 minutes remaining for this particular time period for the majority.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss even a broader concept in health care costs. One of the most urgent questions that I get when I am in my district, people wonder how are we going to afford health care costs. How can we afford health insurance? What are the components of that? All of us, myself included, would look for easy solutions. We would want a bill that we could pass that would just limit the cost of care. Maybe it is by fixing prices in the pharmaceutical industry or maybe fixing prices that the doctors are able to charge. Some people want to go in and limit the capability of insurance companies to raise their prices to pay for the costs that they have. Mr. Speaker, anything that we attempt is going to be simplistic and will be, without doubt, ineffective. The reasons that our health care is so expensive, is, frankly because we are demanding it. We have more demand than there is supply. When that is the case, you can either increase the supply, which is the number of doctors and the number of hospitals, or you can begin to affect demand.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative, as long as we are going to try to solve the problem, we may address the supply, we may address the numbers of doctors, we may address the numbers of hospitals, but that does not completely deal with the problem that I see, that is, on the demand side. I think that the first step for us all is to begin to live healthier life-styles. There is one study which reports that if we lost nationwide 10 pounds per person that the incidence of diabetes could be cut by 25 percent nationwide. Nationwide diabetes is an exploding phenomenon that is going to affect the health care costs for every single one of us, even though we are not all affected by it. If we look at our young population, we are finding that exercise and healthy choices are so bad that youth diabetes is exploding in the country, also.

I will tell the Speaker and this assembled group that these health problems into the future raise such tremendous concerns on costs for budgets, quality of life, that we need to begin to make healthier choices. We need to make healthier choices in our life regarding smoking, regarding physical exercise, regarding illegal substances that we place into our bodies. All of those are things which affect the demand, the demand which causes health care costs to increase daily.

I think one of the things that we need to be smarter about in this country and which would also begin to lower that demand curve for the medical services and begin to affect the cost shifts upward each year is in regard to preventive medicines. We all need to be doing careful screenings, cholesterol checks. We should be doing the cancer screenings. I heard statistics today about the way that breast cancer is really spreading in this country. Breast cancer is a curable problem and one that is affecting, I think, 1 out of every 3 or 4 women. Mr. Speaker, if we will begin to do the screenings and the preventive medicines, we will find that long-term our costs will begin to deflate also.

The health savings accounts, we have already discussed how that can affect long term the cost of our medical care and the cost of associated insurance.

One of the things that we are wanting to institute in this particular bill is more competition.

□ 2115

If we look at a couple of examples right now in the medical community of competition, I think Lasik eye surgery is one of the examples, also reconstructive surgery, the plastic surgery. Both of those elements have had competition introduced into their sphere in the last couple of years; and we have seen, I think, 30 percent decreases in the cost of those particular services. Competition is one of the important aspects of not only the American way of life but also in any free market enterprise, and we should see that always competition is never forbidden but encouraged, and it should be that way in our medical field.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) mentioned that one of the most important things we can do to begin to lower costs of medical treatment rather than to see the constantly inflating and increasing cost of medical treatment is medical liability. Many physicians in my district talk about the escalating medical liability costs. Each year we face the prospect that more and more doctors are going to just stop practicing medicine. So instead of increasing the supply, we are actually decreasing the supply, which is going to give more incentive for prices to go up higher even. Medical liability is one of the most serious problems in day-to-day costs of health care and needs to be addressed. This House has addressed it. We feel like it is a thing that should be pushed on through the full Congress and sent to the President for signature.

I think, finally, the good doctor mentioned several times, and in good components, the cost of defensive medicine. Defensive medicine is not just in fear of lawsuits. Defensive medicine is when our doctors begin to prescribe more tests than should actually be done because they are afraid that they will be sued if they do not prescribe every single test that is available. Defensive medicine is when doctors begin to order more rather than exactly which tests they believe are the right ones, which procedures they believe to be right. It is in that defensive medicine, that overprescribing, that overtreating that we find, as the good doctor says, $50 billion worth of cost in this country alone and that one single step of changing that parameter in our health care costs could pay for, for instance, this Medicare prescription drug bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to make choices in this Nation that are expensive. In this particular case, this particular bill, it was the right thing because we have seniors who are having to choose between food and medicine. There is an immediate impact in this Medicare prescription drug bill which will give to our low-income seniors right now this year a $600 card that is good for any purchase of prescription drugs throughout the rest of the year. Next year the same thing is going to happen. Those people at lower incomes, $18,000 and below for a couple, will receive another $600 card next year, which will be good to help them defray the cost of the prescription drugs.

As we look at the plan itself, we have a lot of critics who are describing the gap and being very critical of the gap in the pharmaceutical coverage. I will tell those people that are assembled here today that the single most important reason we did that was to be able to afford the bill. We did not want to break the next generations because we paid for full coverage for every single person in this Nation.

I have often explained that my mom is one of the people who experienced the gap. Her income and her assets are high enough that she will be faced with seeing that coverage up to a point and then a gap and then the protection for catastrophic coverage. I asked her what she felt about it. She explained to me that she understood why we were doing it. She explained that she had felt blessed in her life, that she would gladly pay more in order to make it where it is affordable for the next generations.

Mr. Speaker, those people who are being so critical of this particular aspect of the bill I think are being disingenuous. They talk about the cost of the bill on the one hand, while complaining about the gap on the other. I am sorry. They simply have to choose one or the other. They have to choose full coverage and the high price above $1 trillion versus the $400 to $500 billion that we are facing in this bill as it stands. Either they choose full coverage and the higher price, or they give the gap in the lower price. We in this House and in the Senate and in the bill that was passed and signed by the President chose to allow those people to pay more who could pay more in order to make this bill more affordable for the next generations.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the President's calm and patient leadership on this matter. The President never wavered in his commitment to provide coverage for those seniors who are not able to provide coverage for themselves. And I think that this House chose rightly in passing that bill, and I think that the seniors are finding that it is going to be one of the tremendous changes in the way that we present medical coverage through the Medicare program in this country.

I appreciate, also, the President's leadership in many other issues. We have taken on serious issues in this House, and we have passed them. Not all have made it to the President, but many have made it to the President. We took bold steps to reinvigorate the economy. The economy, as we understand, had suffered from three deep shocks: the collapse of the dot-com industry back in the ending years of President Clinton's term; 9–11 was the second big shock. The third big shock were the corporations that were acting improperly. Global Crossing is a good example. Enron is also an example that has been used. When those companies began to act improperly, people began to suck their money out of the stock market and put it into interest-bearing accounts at the bank. Those three shocks to our economy were ones that were very difficult, and many economies could not have sustained them. The President has patiently built our economy back with a series of tax decreases to the American public. Many of those tax decreases fall on businesses which are able to maintain profitability, increase their employment, grow their capacity, increase the capability of competing with those firms overseas. I will tell the Speaker that we have done magnificent work in many areas; and I appreciate, myself, the calm and principled leadership of the President, who has decided to fight this war on terror, to fix Medicare as he saw the Medicare problems to be, to deal with the forests that were burning up throughout the West, to pass the Partial Birth Abortion bill and sign that, to pass the AMBER alert bill and to get that signed.

Mr. Speaker, we have done magnificent work in this House. The President has signed much of it into law. But one of the most dramatic things we have done is to pass this prescription drug Medicare reform bill, which I think is going to make sure that Medicare is available throughout the rest of this generation and on into the future for my children and my grandchildren.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. EMANUEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family commitment.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for the weeks of March 8 and March 15 on account of medical reasons.

## 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. HINCHEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BALLANCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, March 17.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 17 and 18.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 17 and 18.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, March 17.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, March 17.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, for 5 minutes, today and March 18.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today and March 17.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HEFLEY, 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 $1,372.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2043. An act to designate a Federal building in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the ''Ronald Reagan Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3724. An act to amend section 220 of the National Housing Act to make a technical correction to restore allowable increases in the maximum mortgage limits for FHA-insured mortgages for multifamily housing projects to cover increased costs of installing a solar energy system or residential energy conservation measures.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1881. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to make technical corrections relating to the amendments made by the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on March 12, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3915. To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through April 2, 2004.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 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:

7171. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 04-002-1] received March 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7172. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cattle From Mexico [Docket No. 00-112-2] received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7173. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Missouri [Docket No. 01-015-1] received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7174. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Unshu Oranges from Honshu Island, Japan [Docket No. 02-108-2] received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7175. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Blood and Tissue Collection at Slaughtering and Rendering Establishments [Docket No. 99-017-3] (RIN: 0579-AB13) received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7176. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of intent to use funds provided in Public Law 107-38, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States, FY 2001, for the Commission on Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction; (H. Doc. No. 108–174); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7177. A letter from the Acting Assisstant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf—Revision of Requirements Governing Outer Continental Shelf Rights-of-Use and Easement and Pipeline Rights-of-Way (RIN: 1010-AC91) received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7178. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, BCIS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eliminating the Numerical Cap on Mexican TN Nonimmigrants [CIS No. 2266-03] (RIN: 1615-AA96) received March 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the designation as ''foreign terrorist organizations'' pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1189; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7180. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, National Cemetary Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility for an Approriate Government Marker for a Grave Already Marked at Private Expense (RIN: 2900-AL40) received March 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7181. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Federal Tax Treatment of Benefits received Under the Smallpox Emergency Personnel Protection Act of 2003 [Notice 2004-17] received March 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7182. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Low-Income Housing Credit (Rev. Rul. 2004-16) received March 5, 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. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 1375. A bill to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–152, Pt. 3). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3872. A bill to prohibit the misappropriation of databases while ensuring consumer access to factual information (Rept. 108–437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 561. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces (Rept. 108–438). 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. GINGREY (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 3970. A bill to provide for the implementation of a Green Chemistry Research and Development Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to credit the Highway Trust Fund with the full amount of fuel taxes, to combat fuel tax evasion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 3972. A bill to ensure that appropriate State social services officers have the authority to access certain Federal databases for the purpose of carrying out checks in cases of child abuse and neglect and cases of missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits and pay-as-you-go through fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 3974. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to impose restrictions and limitations on high-cost mortgages, to revise the permissible fees and charges on certain loans made, to prohibit unfair or deceptive practices by mortgage brokers and creditors, and to provide for public education and counseling about predatory lenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BALLANCE:

H.R. 3975. A bill to authorize States, in the event of inadequate Federal funding under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to waive certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the depreciation adjustments required in computing alternative minimum taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 3977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit, welfare-to-work credit, and research credit against the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to designation of foreign terrorist organizations, to amend the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, to include in annual Department of State country reports on terrorism information on terrorist groups that seek weapons of mass destruction and groups that have been designated as foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3979. A bill to exempt the natural aging process in the determination of the production period for distilled spirits under section 263A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H. Con. Res. 385. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to negotiate a bilateral security agreement with the Iraqi Governing Council before June 30, 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. REYES, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EVANS, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H. Con. Res. 386. Concurrent resolution congratulating the United States Air Force Academy on its 50th Anniversary and recognizing its contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DREIER:

H. Res. 561. A resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces.

By Mr. REYES:

H. Res. 562. A resolution honoring and congratulating Don Haskins on his 50 years of contributions to the game of basketball and his efforts in support of diversity in sports; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H. Res. 563. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the one-year anniversary of the human rights crackdown in Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 119: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 290: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 434: Ms. HARRIS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 669: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 677: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 812: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 814: Mr. POMEROY and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 834: Mr. BURNS.

H.R. 857: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 936: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 995: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 996: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1002: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1005: Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1034: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASE, Ms. LEE, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1052: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1057: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1083: Mr. WU, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1118: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1125: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1258: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1267: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BACA, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 1345: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 1357: Mr. GORDON and Mr. WU.

H.R. 1464: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1508: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1655: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1688: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1726: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1742: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1748: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1749: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1755: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1783: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1824: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2085: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2133: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2151: Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2169: Ms. MAJETTE.

H.R. 2260: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2269: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 2291: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2293: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 2366: Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2404: Mr. CROWLEY and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 2449: Mr. GORDON and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 2482: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2490: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2505: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 2509: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2536: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2570: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2665: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2671: Mr. GOSS..

H.R. 2702: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 2768: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 2771: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 2823: Mr. BURNS.

H.R. 2926: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2932: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2933: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 2944: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2978: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2999: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3007: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3015: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3049: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3052: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3115: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 3134: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3171: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3213: Mr. TERRY, Ms. HART, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3277: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3325: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3360: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 3361: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3363: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3377: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3403: Mr. JOHN and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 3410: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 3416: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3441: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 3453: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3459: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3473: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 3474: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HALL, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3528: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 3543: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 3550: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3587: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3599: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3643: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 3668: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3673: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 3687: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3695: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 3699: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 3704: Mr. COX.
H.R. 3708: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 3716: Mr. BURR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 3720: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3739: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 3743: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3755: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 3793: Mr. KIRK and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3795: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 3800: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3802: Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 3803: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3818: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3820: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. EVANS, Mr THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. FROST, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3834: Mr. BALLANCE.
H.R. 3847: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 3854: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 3857: Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 3860: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 3884: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3887: Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 3889: Mr. BURR and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 3919: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3934: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3943: Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 3946: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 3966: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.J. Res. 87: Mr. NADLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. LEACH.
H. Con. Res. 242: Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H. Con. Res. 257: Ms. HART.
H. Con. Res. 304: Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H. Con. Res. 311: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H. Con. Res. 343: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 363: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 365: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BACA, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. JOHN.
H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. PORTER.
H. Con. Res. 374: Mr. KLINE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. EDWARDS.
H. Con. Res. 378: Mr. KIRK and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Res. 28: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Res. 45: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H. Res. 466: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 470: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Res. 479: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H. Res. 528: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BURNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 551: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KIND, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. ENGLISH.
H. Res. 558: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.