



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2004

No. 37

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 23, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE KING 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 Texas (Mr. DELAY).

COMPETING VISIONS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up the budget resolution for fiscal year 2005. This is the document that will set the terms for much of the national debate in this very pivotal year. Issues as unrelated as tax cuts and homeland security, law enforcement and space exploration, and the deficit and the international democracy and diplomacy will all be affected by this budget.

Anyone who believes there are no real differences between the two parties should watch this week's debate, read the competing budget proposals,

and see how stark these differences really are.

The Republican budget is built on the principles of strength, growth, and opportunity. To secure our Nation and win the war on terror, it increases defense spending by 7 percent; it provides for more than \$33 billion in non-military homeland security initiatives to fund America's first responders, law enforcement officers and the every day heroes who keep our communities safe.

The Republican budget will provide the framework by which Congress can help maintain the economic recovery. It will protect the economy from targeted snap-back tax increases on parents, married couples, and the working class. Our budget will anchor Federal spending by freezing all nonsecurity discretionary spending growth giving the economy breathing room to grow, create jobs, and cut the deficit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the budget will meet all our domestic needs, from health care and education to welfare reform and veterans benefits without leaving any priority behind. The Republican budget speaks clearly to the issues facing our Nation this year.

And to their credit, so does the Democrat's budget. Unfortunately, their budgets, while clear, are just wrong. In not one budget, but in three separate budgets, the minority party will propose job-killing tax increases, more spending, and bigger government as the solutions to our Nation's problems.

The differences between the parties' visions could not be more clear. Democrats trust government, and Republicans trust the American people. This week we will see which vision prevails in this debate and in the minds of the American people.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 8 years since Congress overwhelmingly passed the Defense of Marriage Act in 1996. DOMA, as it is called, passed the Senate by a vote of 85-14 and the House by a vote of 342-67. I was honored to have cosponsored and vote for final passage of this bipartisan legislation which President Clinton signed into law.

We passed DOMA in response to a State court decision because we were concerned that activist judges in Hawaii would force 49 other States to accept gay marriages. We clarified the full faith and credit clause to mean that States do not need to recognize same-sex marriages performed and validated in other States.

At the time, DOMA was a reasonable response to a real problem. Nobody wanted a handful of judges overturning the will of the individual States and millions of American citizens. DOMA relied on the principle of federalism to defend States rights and to preserve the sanctity of marriage. It was a perfect match.

But several momentous events occurred in the next few years which have put DOMA in a difficult light. In 1997 and 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned two duly enacted States' laws regarding homosexuals. In the Lawrence case, the Court even went so far as to overturn one of its previous decisions. More recently, the Supreme Court and other Federal courts have even blatantly disregarded the 2000 Dale decision which gave the Boy Scouts the right to exclude avowed homosexuals from positions of leadership.

In Vermont, the State Supreme Court ordered the State legislature to provide the benefits of marriage to gay couples. Finally, gay marriages have been legalized in several Canadian provinces. These decisions have given

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1327

opponents of DOMA ammunition to challenge it in court.

But in order to challenge DOMA, plaintiffs need standing to sue. That was accomplished a month ago when the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court decision set the stage for a constitutional challenge. There is no doubt if couples start getting married in Massachusetts on May 17, as planned, they will move back to their home States where they will demand that their union be recognized and accepted.

When their States refuse to embrace this new arrangement under the Federal DOMA or one of 39 other "little DOMAs," then there will probably be a challenge to the State or Federal DOMA. It would not be difficult to imagine many Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, using legal precedents and their own personal belief to rule on DOMA's constitutionality.

Let me be clear. As we stand now, DOMA prevents same-sex marriages from being imposed on the individual States. Of course since no State enacted same-sex marriages, there has been no explicit challenge to DOMA. There was a Federal tax evasion case in 2002 in which the defendant claimed that he and his domestic partner were "economic partners" who should be afforded filing status equivalent to that of a married couple and argued that DOMA was unconstitutional. But since the defendant did not even try to have his same-sex union recognized as a marriage under State law, and since DOMA was not even in effect when the defendant was scamming the Federal Government, this argument was not even considered by the court. But as they say on Wall Street, "Past performance is no guarantee of future results."

Lawsuits will continue to be filed, and State laws defining marriage as being between a man and woman will continue to be mocked and ignored by public officials, judges, and bureaucrats. Look at what has happened in San Francisco, New York City, Oregon, New Mexico and many other places over the last month or so. The blatant disregard for the rule of law is astonishing.

These events and rulings over the last few years have compelled many of my colleagues and I, and the administration, to seriously consider the proposed constitutional amendment to our Constitution defining marriage as being between a man and a woman. I have chosen to cosponsor this legislation. We passed DOMA. Thirty-nine States have enacted their own Defense of Marriage Act. The vast majority of Americans oppose gay marriage and do not want such an arrangement forced upon them. We have tried every legal and political avenue possible, but 8 years since DOMA was passed has shown us now that a constitutional amendment may be a better and another way to protect the sanctity of marriage.

LOOMING SOCIAL SECURITY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, a couple very important events are happening today that significantly impact our kids and our grandkids. One is the budget that we are passing. Although it is the best budget, the leanest budget, that we have passed since 1996, this budget still grows overall at about twice the rate of inflation.

If we project that out, to the future and government grows at twice the rate of inflation, eventually we are going to have a government that is much larger relative to our economy and GDP. The other event that has just happened today is the actuaries at the Social Security Administration have released their report on what is going to happen to Social Security. It is not good news in the actuarial report of Social Security. It confirms that Social Security is going broke; less money is coming in than is needed to pay benefits 12 years from now.

We continue in this body and across the Capitol in the Senate and the White House to increase our promises of what we are going to provide to people in the future; These are unfunded liabilities when it is not paid for. So our increased borrowing, how much our deficit spending is; how much we overspend in 1 year, how much we have to borrow in 1 year to accommodate that spending adds up to debt. The debt is a sum of all of the deficit spending. Our deficit is now over \$7 trillion, and so we are going to have to vote again to increase the debt limit.

I brought this chart to show what has happened in the history of the United States when Social Security faces problems of less money coming in than is needed to pay benefits.

This is what has happened on the increase in taxes to accommodate the increased spending, and that is what I am suggesting today. If we do nothing, if we do not deal with this problem, if we do not look at the actuarial report of the huge burden of unfunded liabilities that are facing our kids and grandkids, then I think maybe, for lack of a better word, it is unconscionable.

Just for a moment, in 1940 the rate was 2 percent on the first \$3,000. By 1960, we needed more money, so what did the government do, raise it to 6 percent. In 1980, it was raised to over 10 percent on the first \$26,000; in 2000, 12 percent of the first \$76,000; and now it is 12.4 percent of \$87,900.

□ 1245

When government has needed a little more money, what we have done is increased taxes on working Americans. We have got to change from a program of fixed benefits over the next 60 years to a program of fixed contributions. Almost every other State has done that.

To fix this around the edges simply puts off the problem to a future date and a future generation, which again I suggest is unfair.

For everybody that is interested, I suggest that you take the time, look at the Web site of the actuarial report from the Social Security Administration, and I will just say it, www.ssa.gov/OACT/TR. That report says that the severe long-term consequences are enormous without action.

I compliment President Bush for saying that we have got to move ahead on this, that we have got to have a bipartisan group come to grips and understand the enormity of this problem of Social Security. It is a program that has been developed, that now we have 80 percent of our population that are retired that depend on Social Security benefits for 90 percent or more of their total retirement income. It needs to be fixed.

It is not fair for this Chamber to demagogue the issue and simply go into this election year trying to scare seniors. If they listen to some other party of a proposed solution to Social Security that it is going to ruin their Social Security.

I guess what I am trying to say is, I ask every voter, Mr. Speaker, to go and ask the candidates for President, to ask every candidate for the United States Senate, to ask every candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives what proposal have you introduced, what proposal have you signed on to as a cosponsor that is going to make sure that we keep Social Security solvent.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, we call upon Your holy name in prayer. To take time for prayer helps us focus on Your presence in our midst.

Prayer does not make You present, for You are the Almighty, the ever-present, far beyond us and our imagining. You hold everyone and everything in Your creative hand, redeeming every minute for the people of Your covenant and of Your communion.

By being mindful and presenting ourselves to You, we state our desire that

You bless all in this assembly and in this Nation. We open our minds to the possibility of Your goodness manifested throughout the activities of this day. We open our hearts to receive the love, loyalty, virtue, and collaboration of one another.

In this way You strengthen, with lasting effect, all our labor and You fortify this union, both now and hopefully forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE 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 a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent Resolution recognizing the 91st annual meeting of The Garden Club of America.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Helping to Enhance the Livelihood of People (HELP) Around the Globe Commission—

Leo J. Hindery, Jr. of New York; and Gayle E. Smith of Washington, D.C.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 104(c)(1)(A) of Pub-

lic Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program:

Ms. Christine Vick of Washington, D.C.

YOU CANNOT HAVE IT BOTH WAYS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, recently, a Democrat candidate for President was asked about his vote against the \$87 billion that went to support our troops in Iraq and to build schools and hospitals for the Iraqi people. He said this: "I voted for it before I voted against it."

This rhetoric is so typical of many who want to have it both ways. They vote to give President Bush the authority to send American troops into Iraq, to oust one of the most brutal dictators in history and a supporter of terrorism around the world; but now they say we never should have gone to Iraq, that it was unjustified that the President acted unilaterally.

The fact is, on October 10, 2002, a bipartisan majority in this body voted to authorize the use of force in Iraq. And then, in October of last year, we voted to supply our troops on the front lines. Unfortunately, many of the same people who voted to send our men and women off to war then voted against them when the time came to give them the resources they needed to do their job and get home safe. You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BOB ZANGAS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Nation, we honor a man today who recently lost his life while serving our country.

Bob Zangas of Level Green, Pennsylvania, first went to Iraq as a Marine and later returned as a civilian to help rebuild that country. He described a land that "is in desperate need of everything," where he felt he "was pouring a cup of water out into a dry desert," but believing some day it would make flowers grow.

He lived on a hope that he made a difference, and he did. Americans and Iraqis alike mourn his passing, but celebrate his accomplishments. His wife, Brenda, described him as a true patriotic American, humanitarian, and Marine, and, foremost, a father and husband.

He closed one of his last letters with a challenge to "hang on to your dreams," and that is just what he did to the very end. It is a dream of compassion. It is a dream of freedom. And for that, the whole world is grateful.

Thank you, Lieutenant Colonel Bob Zangas. We shall hold on to our dreams.

STOP THE GAS TAX INCREASE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to recent proposals to raise the Federal gas tax. As the former chairman of the South Carolina State Senate Transportation Committee, I know that raising taxes on America's families is not the proper answer to building a better road system.

The gas tax is a regressive tax that affects low-income Americans disproportionately. The revered Heritage Foundation recently noted that analysis shows that increasing the gas tax would depress economic activity and the incomes of millions of Americans. It would also significantly raise less revenue than its proponents project.

Instead of raising the burden on overtaxed American families, we should better manage taxpayers' money. Millions of dollars are diverted every year on low-priority roadside enhancements that are not urgent safety matters. Also, we should repeal Davis-Bacon. As the Nonpartisan Americans For Tax Reform has noted, transportation costs would decrease by an estimated 8 to 30 percent if Congress would remove the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirement.

I ask all of my colleagues to oppose any attempt to raise the gas tax on American families.

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

LESSON IN CONNECTING THE DOTS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as the basketball games concluded, I was not quick enough to the TV dial; and I was exposed to a 20-minute infomercial that was passed off as a news interview.

We are told a lot these days about connecting the dots, and I just want to help people connect the dots just a little bit.

Mr. Clark, Mr. Dick Clark, Richard Clark was on the CBS news show "60 Minutes." CBS, as we learned during the Super Bowl last year after the half-time show, is owned by Viacom. The publisher of the Clark book is owned by Simon and Shuster. Simon and Shuster, according to their Web site, is the publishing operation of Viacom, Incorporated, one of the world's premier media companies.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clark closed his interview with a comment which actually should have been first. He said, all

of us perhaps share some blame for 9-11, and I am partly to blame. Yes, Mr. Clark, indeed you are, and those should have been the first words out of your mouth. While you are at it, how about Mogadishu? How about the first World Trade Center bombing? What about our servicemen at the Kobar Towers? What about the two embassy bombings in Iraq? And, Mr. Clark, what about the Cole?

COUNCIL OF GREAT CITY SCHOOLS REPORT

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a report recently issued by the Council of Great City Schools that showed solid improvement in test scores among the most disadvantaged students. Fourth graders scored an impressive 4.9 points higher in reading and 6.8 points higher in math than in previous years. Eighth grade reading and math scores increased by 1.1 and 3 points respectively.

No Child Left Behind is working. Before the act, many of these disadvantaged children might have been allowed to slip through the cracks. Now schools are accountable; no one can slip behind.

These successes and others like it are due to massive increases in education funding and an additional \$1 billion in title 1 money in fiscal year 2004, and we hope another \$1 billion increase this year.

Congratulations to these students and their teachers who demonstrate that with the increased accountability and funding under No Child Left Behind, every child can succeed.

NEW MEDICARE BILL PROVIDES MORE OPTIONS FOR SENIORS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I opened up Roll Call and among the first things to catch my attention was an article about the Democrats' message and their effort to get out the message on Medicare reform. I thought, well, better late than never. Perhaps they would now start talking about the plan this Congress and the President passed to help our seniors with their prescription drug costs for the first time ever. I thought that maybe the Democrats were finally ready to talk to our seniors about the inclusion of preventive care that starts with a free physical when the seniors enter Medicare. I thought that maybe Democrats would join us in talking about how we will, through the Medicare reform bill, begin working toward a 21st-century health care system for our seniors so that their prescription drug usage is better coordinated to pre-

vent overusage and harmful interactions.

I should have known better.

Democrats continue to resist informing seniors about the new options available. This Medicare reform is law, and it will provide seniors with more options and more choices than ever. I hope my colleagues across the aisle will reconsider their tactics.

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.

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 2004

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 958) to authorize certain hydrographic services programs, to name a cove in Alaska in honor of the late Able Bodied Seaman Eric Steiner Koss, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 958

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hydrographic Services Amendments of 2004".

TITLE I—NOAA HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 101. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 (33 U.S.C. 892 et seq.).

SEC. 102. FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) REGIONAL NAVIGATION RESPONSE TEAMS.—Section 303(a) (33 U.S.C. 892a(a)) is amended by striking paragraphs (7) and (8) and inserting the following:

"(7) establish, equip, and maintain up to 4 Regional Navigation Response teams in priority coastal areas identified by the Secretary, in consultation with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, to conduct activities related to navigational safety and the validation of hydrographic data;

"(8) to the greatest extent practicable and cost-effective, fulfill the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (7) through contracts or other agreements with private sector entities; and

"(9) participate in the development of, and implement for the United States in cooperation with other appropriate Federal agencies, international standards for hydrographic data and hydrographic services."

(b) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—Section 303 (33 U.S.C. 892a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To help fulfill the duties of the Administrator, including authorities under the Act of 1947 (33 U.S.C. 883a et seq.), this Act, or in response to a maritime emergency, the Administrator may—

"(A) establish a volunteer program; and

"(B) enter into special agreements with qualified organizations to assist in the implementation of a volunteer program.

"(2) LEGAL STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS.—

"(A) Paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 7(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(c)) shall apply to volunteers who provide services to the Administrator under a volunteer program established under paragraph (1).

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), any reference in section 7(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(c)) to the Secretary of Interior or the Secretary of Commerce is deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(3) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—In this subsection, the term 'qualified organization' means a nongovernmental, not-for-profit organization, determined by the Administrator to have demonstrated expertise in boating safety and a commitment to improving the quality of hydrographic services and related oceanographic and meteorological information that is made available to mariners.

"(e) PARTICIPATION IN JOINT INSTITUTE.—The Secretary may participate in a joint institute that develops new hydrographic technology and conducts academic, educational, and outreach activities that assist the Administrator in fulfilling the functions of the Administrator under this section."

SEC. 103. KOSS COVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or existing policy, the cove described in subsection (b) shall be known and designated as "Koss Cove", in honor of the late Able Bodied Seaman Eric Steiner Koss of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel RAINIER who died in the performance of a nautical charting mission off the Alaskan coast.

(b) COVE DESCRIBED.—The cove referred to in subsection (a) is—

(1) adjacent to and southeast of Point Elrington, Alaska, and forms a portion of the southern coast of Elrington Island;

(2) ¾ mile across the mouth;

(3) centered at 59 degrees 56.1 minutes North, 148 degrees 14 minutes West; and

(4) 45 miles of Seward, Alaska.

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the cove described in subsection (b) is deemed to be a reference to Koss Cove.

SEC. 104. DEPICTION OF SAME SHORELINES ON CHARTS AND MAPPING PRODUCTS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Act, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall provide to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan to depict the same shorelines on National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration nautical charts and United States Geological Survey mapping products.

SEC. 105. AMENDMENTS TO THE HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES PANEL.

Section 305 of the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 (33 U.S.C. 892c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Secretary of Commerce"; and

(2) in subsection (c)(3), subsection (d), and subsection (e), by striking "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting "Administrator".

SEC. 106. GREAT LAKES WATER LEVEL MEASUREMENTS.

Section 306(5) of the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 (33 U.S.C. 892d(5)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as clauses (i) through (v), respectively;

(2) by striking “(5)” and inserting “(5)(A)”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Of the amounts authorized under subparagraph (A), \$2,000,000 in each fiscal year is authorized for the Great Lakes Water Level Observation Network.”.

TITLE II—FISHERY SURVEY VESSELS**SEC. 201. FISHERY SURVEY VESSELS.**

Section 302(c) of the Fisheries Survey Vessel Authorization Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 891b note) is amended by striking “\$60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003” and inserting “\$51,000,000 for fiscal year 2005 and \$39,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.”

SEC. 202. ACQUISITION OF HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY VESSEL.

No later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

(1) a detailed requirements package and cost estimate for the construction and equipping of a hydrographic survey vessel that is capable of—

(A) staying at sea continuously for at least 30 days;

(B) carrying at least 4 hydrographic survey launches;

(C) conducting hydrographic surveys; and

(D) conducting other work necessary to provide mariners with the accurate and timely data needed to conduct safe and efficient maritime commerce;

(2) an explanation of what vessel or vessels would be retired if a vessel described in paragraph (1) were to become operational; and

(3) a comparison of the 10-year estimated costs of operation and maintenance of a new vessel described in paragraph (1) versus such costs for a vessel or vessels proposed for retirement under paragraph (2).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 958.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Commerce, through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, is responsible for the United States navigation services programs. These include the collection of hydrographic data, the production and distribution of nautical charts, the maintenance of geodetic reference systems, and the measurement and prediction of tides and currents.

In the 1990s, years of budget cuts and a revolution in technology left NOAA decades behind in meeting its mission goals and made it unable to provide the up-to-date products needed to assure safe and efficient marine transportation. In response to this problem, Congress enacted the Hydrographic Services Act of 1998. Coupled with increased appropriations, the 1998 act has reduced the nautical charting backlog for areas critical to navigation and modernized NOAA hydrographic, geodetic, and tide and current measurement programs.

To build on that reauthorization, H.R. 958 creates four regional navigation response teams which will conduct activities related to navigational safety and the validation of hydrographic data. The bill allows the Secretary of Commerce to accept volunteer services and create a volunteer program.

□ 1415

Section 103 of the bill names a cove in Alaska for a sailor who drowned while on a nautical charting mission. The bill requires the Secretary to provide Congress with a plan to depict shorelines consistently on NOAA and the United States Geographical Survey maps. It makes technical modifications to the Hydrographic Services Panel. It also clarifies that \$2 million of the funds authorized each fiscal year are for the Great Lakes Water Level Observation Network.

Finally, Title II of the bill reauthorizes the Fishery Survey Vessel Authorization Act of 2000 for 2 years and authorizes the Secretary to provide Congress with a plan detailing requirements for the cost for the construction and equipping of the hydrographic survey vessel.

H.R. 958 will continue the progress we have made to get our coastline surveys up to date and to make our ports and waterways safer. This is a noncontroversial bill and I urge all Members to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, especially NOAA's hydrographic survey, current and tide measurements, and nautical charts are extremely important to ensure safe marine commerce and navigation.

H.R. 958 is noncontroversial legislation that would make helpful amendments to the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act to clarify authority and address recognized gaps in operations.

I am pleased that this legislation would authorize emergency response survey teams to go in and resurvey coastal areas after catastrophic storms which will enhance safe navigation for

both commercial mariners and recreational boaters. I am also very much appreciative that this legislation includes my amendment adopted by the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans to authorize specific annual funding for water level observations important to my State of Michigan.

Great Lakes water level measurements constitute one of the longest, high-quality hydrological data sets in North America. Reference gauge records begin as far back as 1860 and some sporadic records date back to the early 1800s.

We will learn from these observations that the water levels of the Great Lakes can and do fluctuate greatly from year to year. These fluctuations can have dramatic negative consequences for shipping, port and marine operations, and lakeshore erosion throughout the Great Lakes Basin.

My amendment will ensure that adequate funding is allocated by NOAA to carry out those important observations in the future.

In closing, NOAA's navigation and hydrographic services are vital to the economic and environmental well-being of our Nation, and I urge all Members to support this noncontroversial bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 958, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE VOLUNTEER ACT OF 2003

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2408) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2408

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Act of 2003”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS UNDER FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956.

Section 7(f) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2009.”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS UNDER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM VOLUNTEER AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1998.

Section 4(a) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 742f note) is amended—

- (1) in the heading by striking “PILOT”;
- (2) by striking “pilot project” each place it appears and inserting “project”;
- (3) in paragraph (1) by striking “, but not more than 20 pilot projects nationwide”;
- (4) in paragraph (3)—
 - (A) by striking “pilot projects” and inserting “projects”; and
 - (B) by striking “after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “after the date of the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Act of 2003, and every 3 years thereafter”; and
 - (5) in paragraph (4) by striking “each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002” and inserting “for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2009”.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.

Section 7(d)(2) (A) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(d)(2)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Interior may negotiate and enter into a cooperative agreement with a partner organization, academic institution, State or local government agency, or other person to implement one or more projects or programs for a refuge or complex of geographically related refuges in accordance with the purposes of this subsection and in compliance with the policies of other relevant authorities, regulations, and policy guidance.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2408.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the bill, H.R. 2408, to reauthorize the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Act, which I authored in 1998.

There is no question that volunteers play an invaluable role in the successful operation of hundreds of National Wildlife Refuges throughout the United States. Since 1982, the number of refuge volunteers has grown from about

4,200 individuals to over 39,000 people. In the past year alone, volunteers have contributed over 1.4 million man-hours of their own time to the refuge system. From operating a backhoe, assisting in the banding of birds or providing education to the public, to many other functions, volunteers can do it all.

At the hearing of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans held in June of this year, significant support for the volunteer program was very evident. A number of suggestions were made to improve the existing 1998 landmark law, and at the subcommittee markup these suggestions were incorporated into the bill. Included in these changes is the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements outside the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreements Act of 1977 with academic institutions, State and local agencies, and partner organizations, like the “Friends” groups that exist at many refuges. The Cooperative Agreement Act has been a hindrance to the Secretary in entering into these agreements. H.R. 2408 would clarify that Congress intended to give the Secretary the same flexibility that the Secretary has to enter into these agreements under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

I urge all Members to support the Refuge Volunteer Program by voting yes on this legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as noted by the previous speaker, H.R. 2408 is noncontroversial legislation that would reauthorize the existing authority that promotes volunteer programs and community partnerships across our National Wildlife Refuge System.

Volunteers provide truly indispensable hours of service to augment the yeoman labor of our Federal resource managers, rangers, and biologists stretched thin by the day-to-day demands of managing 98 million acres of fish and wildlife habitat. Congress should do all that it can to encourage the expansion of volunteer opportunities at our National Wildlife Refuges.

I commend the act's author and the bill's sponsor, my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), for his continued steadfast leadership in promoting our refuges as places for both people to enjoy and wildlife to have a proper habitat.

I also congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and the ranking Democratic member of that subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), for developing mutually acceptable language to clarify the authority for the Fish and Wildlife Serv-

ice to enter into cooperative agreements in support of volunteer activities.

This clarification should not only help spur the creation of new partnerships, but also enhance private sources of support for our refuges.

This is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2408, “The National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Act.”

Since the first refuge was established in my home state in 1912, the Wisconsin refuge system has become an integral part of life for our citizens. Our five wildlife refuges and two wetlands management districts attract nearly 2 million visitors each year. They provide critical habitat for our state's world-renowned wildlife resources, as well as opportunities for recreation and groundbreaking research.

Thankfully, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has help in meeting President Teddy Roosevelt's commitment of protecting our country's diverse wildlife heritage for future generations. Volunteers like my constituent John Wetzel, and the “Friends of the Upper Mississippi River Refuges,” work constantly to improve our local refuges and serve as advocates at the national level.

John Wetzel is only one of over 45,000 individuals across the country who provide support for our refuge system. These “Friends of the Refuge” do whatever is needed—whether it is raising funds, guiding tours, battling invasive species or restoring wetlands. As noted anthropologist, Margaret Mead, once said, “Never doubt that a small thoughtful group of concerned citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.”

I am proud to support the National Fish and Wildlife Service in its vital mission, and I'm pleased this legislation will provide these dedicated activists the tools and information necessary to help them in their efforts on behalf of us all.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2408, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SAXTON. 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.

COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ACT

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

(H.R. 2489) to provide for the distribution of judgment funds to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2489

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

SECTION 1. COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ACT.

This Act shall be known as the "Cowlitz Indian Tribe Distribution of Judgment Funds Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Act—

(1) The term "current judgment fund" means the funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 218 and all interest accrued thereon as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The term "initial interest" means the interest on the funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 218 during the time period from one year before the date of the enactment of this Act through the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The term "principal" means the funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 218 and all interest accrued thereon as of one year before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The term "tribe" means the Cowlitz Indian Tribe of Washington, which was extended Federal acknowledgment by the United States Department of the Interior on December 31, 2001, pursuant to part 83 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations.

(6) The term "tribal member" means an individual who is an enrolled member of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe pursuant to tribal enrollment procedures and requirements.

(7) The term "tribe's governing body" means the Cowlitz Tribal Council, which is the tribe's governing body under the tribe's Constitution.

(8) The term "tribal elder" means any tribal member who was 62 years of age or older as of February 14, 2000.

SEC. 3. JUDGMENT DISTRIBUTION PLAN.

Notwithstanding the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1401, et seq.), or any plan prepared or promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to that Act, the judgment funds awarded in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 218 and interest accrued thereon as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be distributed and used in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 4. DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF FUNDS.

(a) **PRINCIPAL PRESERVED AFTER ELDERLY ASSISTANCE AND TRIBAL ADMINISTRATION PAYMENTS.**—(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), the principal shall not be distributed under this Act. Only the interest earned on the undistributed principal may be used to fund such programs. There will be no distribution of any funds other than as specified in this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall—

(A) maintain undistributed current judgment funds in an interest-bearing account in trust for the tribe; and

(B) disburse principal or interest in accordance with this Act not later than 30 days after receipt by the Northwest Regional Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, of a request by the tribe's governing body for such disbursement of funds.

(b) **ELDERLY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—(1) From the current judgment fund, the Secretary shall set aside 20 percent for an elderly assistance payment. The Secretary shall provide one elderly assistance payment to each enrolled tribal elder not later than 30 days after all of the following have occurred:

(A) The tribe's governing body has compiled and reviewed for accuracy a list of all enrolled

tribal members that are both a minimum of one-sixteenth Cowlitz blood and 62 years of age or older as of February 14, 2000.

(B) The Secretary has verified the blood quantum and age of the tribal members identified on the list prepared pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(C) The tribe's governing body has made a request for disbursement of judgment funds for the elderly assistance payment.

(2) If a tribal elder eligible for an elderly assistance payment dies before receiving payment under this subsection, the money which would have been paid to that individual shall be added to and distributed in accordance with the emergency assistance program under subsection (c).

(3) The Secretary shall pay all costs of distribution under this subsection out of the amount set aside under paragraph (1).

(c) **EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 10 percent for the Emergency Assistance Program. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be distributed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and will be used to provide emergency assistance for tribal members. 10 percent of the initial interest shall be available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL, AND CULTURAL TRAINING PROGRAM.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 10 percent for an Education, Vocational and Cultural Training Program. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be distributed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and will be used to provide scholarships to tribal members pursuing educational advancement, including cultural and vocational training. 10 percent of the initial interest shall be available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) **HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 5 percent for the Housing Assistance Program. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be disbursed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and may be added to any existing tribal housing improvements programs to supplement them or it may be used in a separate Housing Assistance Program to be established by the tribe's governing body. 5 percent of the initial interest shall be available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TRIBAL, AND CULTURAL CENTERS.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 21.5 percent for economic development and, if other funding is not available or not adequate (as determined by the tribe), for the construction and maintenance of tribal and cultural centers. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be disbursed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and shall be used for the following, with 21.5 percent of the initial interest available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act:

(1) Property acquisition for business or other activities which are likely to benefit the tribe economically or provide employment for tribal members.

(2) Business development for the tribe, including collateralization of loans for the purchase or operation of businesses, matching funds for economic development grants, joint venture partnerships, and other similar ventures, which are likely to produce profits for the tribe. All business loans shall pay principal and interest back to the Economic Development program for reinvestments and business profits shall go to the

tribe's general fund for uses to be determined by the tribe's governing body.

(3) Design, construction, maintenance, and operation of tribal and cultural centers.

(g) **NATURAL RESOURCES.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 7.5 percent for natural resources. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be disbursed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and may be added to any existing tribal natural resource program to enhance the tribe's use and enjoyment of existing and renewable natural resources within the tribe's lands. 7.5 percent of the initial interest shall be available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) **CULTURAL RESOURCES.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 4 percent for cultural resources. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be distributed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and shall be used to maintain artifacts, collect documents, archive, and identify cultural sites of tribal significance. 4 percent of the initial interest shall be available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) **HEALTH.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 21 percent for health. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on such sum shall be disbursed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body and shall be used for the health needs of the tribe. 21 percent of the initial interest shall be available upon the date of the enactment of this Act to fund the program for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(j) **TRIBAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM.**—From the principal, the Secretary shall set aside 21 percent for tribal administration. 21 percent of the initial interest and such of the principal sum set aside for this program as required to fund the first year of this program at \$150,000, the sum of \$150,000 shall be immediately disbursed to the tribe for the purposes of funding tribal administration for the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Beginning the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act, interest earned on the remaining principal set aside under this subsection shall be disbursed annually in a lump sum to the tribe's governing body for operating costs of the tribe's governing body, including travel, telephone, cultural, and other expenses incurred in the conduct of the tribe's affairs, and legal fees as approved by the tribe's governing body.

(k) **GENERAL CONDITIONS.**—The following conditions will apply to the management and use of all funds available under this Act by the tribe's governing body:

(1) No amount greater than 10 percent of the interest earned on the principal designated for any program under this Act may be used for the administrative costs of any of that program, except those programs operated pursuant to subsections (i) and (j).

(2) No service area is implied or imposed under any program under this Act. If the costs of administering any program under this Act for the benefit of tribal members living outside the tribe's Indian Health Service area are greater than 10 percent of the interest earned on the principal designated for that program, the tribe's governing body may authorize the expenditure of such funds for that program.

(3) Before any expenditures, the tribe's governing body must approve all programs and shall publish in a publication of general circulation regulations which provide standards and priorities for programs established in this Act.

(4) Section 7 of the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1407) shall apply to funds available under this Act.

(5) Any tribal member who feels he or she has been unfairly denied the right to take part in any program under this Act may appeal to the tribal secretary. The tribal secretary shall bring the appeal to the tribe's governing body for resolution. The resolution shall be made in a timely manner and the tribal secretary at that time shall respond to the tribal member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2489.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. BAIRD), has introduced legislation to assist a tribe in his district that will finally receive funds they are owed by the Federal Government.

His legislation, H.R. 2489, will provide for the distribution of judgment funds awarded to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. The Cowlitz Indian Tribe has lands in western Washington and the over 1,000 enrolled members are commonly divided into two groups, the Upper Cowlitz and the Lower Cowlitz.

In 1973, the Indian Claims Commission ruled in favor of the tribe, stating that their aboriginal title of the lands had been taken from them and they deserved compensation for the loss of those lands. H.R. 2489 provides for the distribution of the Commission's judgment.

The legislation is also particularly crafted so that the tribe will use the judgment funds in a manner that follows the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act. Uses of the moneys will include programs administered by the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, bringing assistance to tribal elders and educating younger tribal members in the areas of culture and cultural significance.

Specifically, H.R. 2489 distributes moneys from the judgment fund into areas that plague many tribes and are of concern to the Cowlitz tribe as well. To address these issues, the tribe will be using the funding wisely; for example, they will disburse sums annually for tribal housing improvements and for other purposes.

Recognizing tribal health care needs, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe plans to set aside over 20 percent of the principal funding for various health care needs. This will allow the Tribe's Fir Complex in Longview, Washington, to provide more comprehensive health care to the tribal members.

Again, it is important to emphasize that the Cowlitz Indian Tribe will finally be able to use the moneys they are owed in a manner which best fits their needs and continues their sovereignty as well as their positive working relationship with the Federal Government.

The House can now move this legislation forward and help to strengthen the close relationship the Federal Government has with this tribe. Having been federally recognized in 2000, they can use this funding to more easily help their tribe to grow and become increasingly self-sufficient, while retaining their culture.

This legislation represents another step toward tribal government advancement through the many hours of work put in by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Claims Commission and, of course, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe itself. The amendment in the nature of a substitute was supported at the committee level, and I appreciate the bipartisan work of the committee in acting quickly on this legislation.

Finally, I would also like to point out that H.R. 2489, as amended, was passed by the Committee on Resources by a voice vote on October 29, 2003. I hope we can now act in the same bipartisan fashion. I urge adoption of the bill.

Let me commend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for his fine work in bringing this bill forward to us.

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

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2489, legislation that authorizes the distribution plan for the Cowlitz Indian Tribe's judgment funds.

The Cowlitz's compensation will be used to address a variety of tribal priorities, which include a housing assistance program, cultural centers, an elderly assistance program, and both educational and vocational training.

Held in trust by the Bureau of Indian Affairs since 1973, this award furthers the tribe's goal of self-determination, economic development, cultural preservation, and protection of natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for his diligence and hard work. I also want to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for their efforts in bringing this legislation to the floor. This legislation is noncontroversial, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2489.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friends and distinguished colleagues. I would like to begin by acknowledging the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for his good work, as well as my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for their support of this. The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) was also extremely supportive, and I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's (Mr. SAXTON) work and kind remarks in this regard.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge Marie Howard of the Committee on Resources and the staff of the BIA for their diligent work on this project.

This legislation, as has been mentioned, distributes moneys which were awarded to the tribe in 1973 by the Indian Claims Commission. The ICC awarded the tribe \$1.5 million for ancestral lands forcibly confiscated by the Federal Government.

The tribe initially refused the funds as insufficient, and the \$1.5 million award was sent to BIA to remain in an interest-bearing account until the tribe requested its release. In a wonderful example of the power of compound interest, one which would no doubt make Ben Franklin proud, the original \$1.5 million is now worth \$13 million.

In January of 2002, the tribe was formally recognized, but it has scarce funding with which to manage tribal programs. Accordingly, the tribe unanimously determined to seek the release of its ICC award, to fund tribal programs to care for the elderly, expand health care services, provide housing assistance, cover educational expenses and create economic development opportunities.

The legislation before us today requires the vast majority of the ICC fund to remain permanently in an account collecting interest, and only allows the interest collected from the award, from this date forward, to fund tribal programs. This ensures these funds will be available for future generations of Cowlitz people.

The tribe is free to spend the interest accrued on this award as they wish, consistent with the legislation. However, to the extent to which tribal programs will impact local communities, I strongly encourage the tribe to work with local officials. The ICC allocated this money to the Cowlitz, and they will ultimately decide how to spend it; but those decisions will inevitably impact nontribal members as well. As a consequence, I strongly encourage the tribe to work with local officials and community members to ensure that this money is used to the greatest extent possible to the benefit of all concerned.

Finally, I would say that in seeking this money for the Cowlitz, my goal is to ensure they receive the funds to which they have been entitled. However, the passage of this legislation is

not intended in any way to influence BIA's evaluation of the tribe's pending land trust decision.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member. I thank my colleagues.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2489, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SAXTON. 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.

ORGAN DONATION AND RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3926) to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote organ donation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3926

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) PUBLIC AWARENESS OF NEED FOR ORGAN DONATION.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should carry out programs to educate the public with respect to organ donation, including the need to provide for an adequate rate of such donations.

(b) FAMILY DISCUSSIONS OF ORGAN DONATIONS.—Congress recognizes the importance of families pledging to each other to share their lives as organ and tissue donors and acknowledges the importance of discussing organ and tissue donation as a family.

(c) LIVING DONATIONS OF ORGANS.—Congress—

(1) recognizes the generous contribution made by each living individual who has donated an organ to save a life; and

(2) acknowledges the advances in medical technology that have enabled organ transplantation with organs donated by living individuals to become a viable treatment option for an increasing number of patients.

SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT OF TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES INCURRED TOWARD LIVING ORGAN DONATION.

Section 377 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274f) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 377. REIMBURSEMENT OF TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES INCURRED TOWARD LIVING ORGAN DONATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants to States, transplant centers,

qualified organ procurement organizations under section 371, or other public or private entities for the purpose of—

"(1) providing for the reimbursement of travel and subsistence expenses incurred by individuals toward making living donations of their organs (in this section referred to as 'donating individuals'); and

"(2) providing for the reimbursement of such incidental nonmedical expenses that are so incurred as the Secretary determines by regulation to be appropriate.

"(b) PREFERENCE.—The Secretary shall, in carrying out subsection (a), give preference to those individuals that the Secretary determines are more likely to be otherwise unable to meet such expenses.

"(c) CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may, in carrying out subsection (a), consider—

"(1) the term 'donating individuals' as including individuals who in good faith incur qualifying expenses toward the intended donation of an organ but with respect to whom, for such reasons as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, no donation of the organ occurs; and

"(2) the term 'qualifying expenses' as including the expenses of having relatives or other individuals, not to exceed 2, accompany or assist the donating individual for purposes of subsection (a) (subject to making payment for only those types of expenses that are paid for a donating individual).

"(d) RELATIONSHIP TO PAYMENTS UNDER OTHER PROGRAMS.—An award may be made under subsection (a) only if the applicant involved agrees that the award will not be expended to pay the qualifying expenses of a donating individual to the extent that payment has been made, or can reasonably be expected to be made, with respect to such expenses—

"(1) under any State compensation program, under an insurance policy, or under any Federal or State health benefits program;

"(2) by an entity that provides health services on a prepaid basis; or

"(3) by the recipient of the organ.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'donating individuals' has the meaning indicated for such term in subsection (a)(1), subject to subsection (c)(1).

"(2) The term 'qualifying expenses' means the expenses authorized for purposes of subsection (a), subject to subsection (c)(2).

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2005 through 2009."

SEC. 4. PUBLIC AWARENESS; STUDIES AND DEMONSTRATIONS.

Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 377 the following:

"SEC. 377A. PUBLIC AWARENESS; STUDIES AND DEMONSTRATIONS.

"(a) ORGAN DONATION PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall, directly or through grants or contracts, establish a public education program in cooperation with existing national public awareness campaigns to increase awareness about organ donation and the need to provide for an adequate rate of such donations.

"(b) STUDIES AND DEMONSTRATIONS.—The Secretary may make peer-reviewed grants to, or enter into peer-reviewed contracts with, public and nonprofit private entities for the purpose of carrying out studies and demonstration projects to increase organ donation and recovery rates, including living donation.

"(c) GRANTS TO STATES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to States for the purpose of assisting States in carrying out organ donor awareness, public education, and outreach activities and programs designed to increase the number of organ donors within the State, including living donors.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a State shall—

"(A) submit an application to the Department in the form prescribed;

"(B) establish yearly benchmarks for improvement in organ donation rates in the State; and

"(C) report to the Secretary on an annual basis a description and assessment of the State's use of funds received under this subsection, accompanied by an assessment of initiatives for potential replication in other States.

"(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds received under this subsection may be used by the State, or in partnership with other public agencies or private sector institutions, for education and awareness efforts, information dissemination, activities pertaining to the State donor registry, and other innovative donation specific initiatives, including living donation.

"(d) EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network and other appropriate organizations, shall support the development and dissemination of educational materials to inform health care professionals and other appropriate professionals in issues surrounding organ, tissue, and eye donation including evidence-based proven methods to approach patients and their families, cultural sensitivities, and other relevant issues.

"(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2009. Such authorization of appropriations is in addition to any other authorizations of appropriations that are available for such purpose.

"SEC. 377B. GRANTS REGARDING HOSPITAL ORGAN DONATION COORDINATORS.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants to qualified organ procurement organizations and hospitals under section 371 to establish programs coordinating organ donation activities of eligible hospitals and qualified organ procurement organizations under section 371. Such activities shall be coordinated to increase the rate of organ donations for such hospitals.

"(2) ELIGIBLE HOSPITAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible hospital' means a hospital that performs significant trauma care, or a hospital or consortium of hospitals that serves a population base of not fewer than 200,000 individuals.

"(b) ADMINISTRATION OF COORDINATION PROGRAM.—A condition for the receipt of a grant under subsection (a) is that the applicant involved agree that the program under such subsection will be carried out jointly—

"(1) by representatives from the eligible hospital and the qualified organ procurement organization with respect to which the grant is made; and

"(2) by such other entities as the representatives referred to in paragraph (1) may designate.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS.—Each entity receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall—

"(1) establish joint organ procurement organization and hospital designated leadership responsibility and accountability for the project;

"(2) develop mutually agreed upon overall project performance goals and outcome measures, including interim outcome targets; and

“(3) collaboratively design and implement an appropriate data collection process to provide ongoing feedback to hospital and organ procurement organization leadership on project progress and results.

“(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere with regulations in force on the date of enactment of the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act.

“(e) **EVALUATIONS.**—Within 3 years after the award of grants under this section, the Secretary shall ensure an evaluation of programs carried out pursuant to subsection (a) in order to determine the extent to which the programs have increased the rate of organ donation for the eligible hospitals involved.

“(f) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may not award a grant to a qualifying organ donation entity under this section unless such entity agrees that, with respect to costs to be incurred by the entity in carrying out activities for which the grant was awarded, the entity shall contribute (directly or through donations from public or private entities) non-Federal contributions in cash or in kind, in an amount equal to not less than 30 percent of the amount of the grant awarded to such entity.

“(g) **FUNDING.**—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009.”

SEC. 5. STUDIES RELATING TO ORGAN DONATION AND THE RECOVERY, PRESERVATION, AND TRANSPORTATION OF ORGANS.

Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 377B, as added by section 4, the following:

“SEC. 377C. STUDIES RELATING TO ORGAN DONATION AND THE RECOVERY, PRESERVATION, AND TRANSPORTATION OF ORGANS.

“(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION.**—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, shall develop scientific evidence in support of efforts to increase organ donation and improve the recovery, preservation, and transportation of organs.

“(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) conduct or support evaluation research to determine whether interventions, technologies, or other activities improve the effectiveness, efficiency, or quality of existing organ donation practice;

“(2) undertake or support periodic reviews of the scientific literature to assist efforts of professional societies to ensure that the clinical practice guidelines that they develop reflect the latest scientific findings;

“(3) ensure that scientific evidence of the research and other activities undertaken under this section is readily accessible by the organ procurement workforce; and

“(4) work in coordination with the appropriate professional societies as well as the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network and other organ procurement and transplantation organizations to develop evidence and promote the adoption of such proven practices.

“(c) **RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION.**—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, as appropriate, shall provide support for research and dissemination of findings, to—

“(1) develop a uniform clinical vocabulary for organ recovery;

“(2) apply information technology and telecommunications to support the clinical operations of organ procurement organizations;

“(3) enhance the skill levels of the organ procurement workforce in undertaking quality improvement activities; and

“(4) assess specific organ recovery, preservation, and transportation technologies.

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009.”

SEC. 6. REPORT RELATING TO ORGAN DONATION AND THE RECOVERY, PRESERVATION, AND TRANSPORTATION OF ORGANS.

Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 377C, as added by section 5, the following:

“SEC. 377D. REPORT RELATING TO ORGAN DONATION AND THE RECOVERY, PRESERVATION, AND TRANSPORTATION OF ORGANS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31, 2005, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the activities of the Department carried out pursuant to this part, including an evaluation describing the extent to which the activities have affected the rate of organ donation and recovery.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To the extent practicable, each report submitted under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) evaluate the effectiveness of activities, identify effective activities, and disseminate such findings with respect to organ donation and recovery;

“(2) assess organ donation and recovery activities that are recently completed, ongoing, or planned; and

“(3) evaluate progress on the implementation of the plan required under subsection (c)(5).

“(c) **INITIAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**—The initial report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) An evaluation of the organ donation practices of organ procurement organizations, States, other countries, and other appropriate organizations including an examination across all populations, including those with low organ donation rates, of—

“(A) existing barriers to organ donation; and

“(B) the most effective donation and recovery practices.

“(2) An evaluation of living donation practices and procedures. Such evaluation shall include an assessment of issues relating to informed consent and the health risks associated with living donation (including possible reduction of long-term effects).

“(3) An evaluation of—

“(A) federally supported or conducted organ donation efforts and policies, as well as federally supported or conducted basic, clinical, and health services research (including research on preservation techniques and organ rejection and compatibility); and

“(B) the coordination of such efforts across relevant agencies within the Department and throughout the Federal Government.

“(4) An evaluation of the costs and benefits of State donor registries, including the status of existing State donor registries, the effect of State donor registries on organ donation rates, issues relating to consent, and recommendations regarding improving the effectiveness of State donor registries in increasing overall organ donation rates.

“(5) A plan to improve federally supported or conducted organ donation and recovery activities, including, when appropriate, the establishment of baselines and benchmarks to measure overall outcomes of these programs. Such plan shall provide for the ongoing coordination of federally supported or

conducted organ donation and research activities.”

SEC. 7. NATIONAL LIVING DONOR MECHANISMS.

Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 371 the following:

“SEC. 371A. NATIONAL LIVING DONOR MECHANISMS.

“The Secretary may establish and maintain mechanisms to evaluate the long-term effects associated with living organ donations by individuals who have served as living donors.”

SEC. 8. STUDY.

Not later than December 31, 2004, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with appropriate entities, including advocacy groups representing those populations that are likely to be disproportionately affected by proposals to increase cadaveric donation, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that evaluates the ethical implications of such proposals.

SEC. 9. QUALIFIED ORGAN PROCUREMENT ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 371(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3926.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3926, the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act. This legislation, introduced by the Subcommittee on Health chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and I pause here for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to commend the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. BILIRAKIS) effort on this particular bill. He is such a distinguished Member of our body, respected by both sides of the aisle, and his compassion for those in need is unparalleled, and I would hope that we could note for the record his great effort in this particular cause.

This bill reflects a great bipartisan effort and one that passed the Senate late last year. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation.

As most of us know, there is a great unmet need for donated organs and tissue right here in the United States. According to the United Network of Organ Sharing, there are 84,138 people who currently are waiting for transplant, while only 12,133 individuals had donated their organs between January and November of 2003; 23,387 individuals did receive a transplant within that

same time frame, but close to 6,000 individuals died while waiting on the list.

H.R. 3926 responds to this public health crisis by effectively targeting our limited Federal resources towards areas we think will do the most good. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants for the purposes of covering travel and subsistence expenses incurred by living organ donors. Hopefully, this assistance will help ensure that no potential living organ donor is prevented from donating simply because they cannot afford the associated travel costs.

Additionally, H.R. 3926 includes a new grant program that will help to replace organ donation coordinators in hospitals and organ procurement organizations in an effort to increase donation rates. Finally, the bill provides the Secretary with \$15 million in new resources to help State governments and public and nonprofit private entities develop innovative new initiatives designed to increase organ donation rates, including living donation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3926 enjoys strong support within the transplant community and will help us in our efforts to ensure that every American has access to a donated organ or tissue when they need it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3926, the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act. I would like to commend the work of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working in a bipartisan manner to craft this important legislation and for working to encourage more efficient and widespread organ donation activities.

Each day in America, nearly 70 people receive an organ transplant, and while this number is amazing, there are other numbers that are far more troubling. At day's end, 18 people on an organ transplant waiting list will have died because not enough organs are available. Nearly 85,000 men, women and children are currently awaiting life-saving transplants, and every 13 minutes another name is added to the national transplant waiting list.

According to the Institute of Medicine, which is part of the National Academy of Sciences, report *Organ Procurement and Transplantation*, many factors have been found to affect the organ donation rates, including the attitudes of the donor's family, the policies and practices of hospital staff and organ procurement organizations, and the manner in which individuals are approached about a donation.

Sadly, while most Americans indicate that they support an organ donation, only about 50 percent of the families who are asked to donate a loved one's organs agree to do so. Equally

perplexing is the interplay between cultural attitudes and race/ethnicity and how this affects rates of organ donation among racial/ethnic minority groups.

The IOM reports that the perception of fairness and effectiveness in distribution of donated organs is as important as other factors in affecting donation rates beneficially. Members of racial/ethnic minorities comprise approximately 25 percent of the population, yet represent close to 50 percent of patients on organ transplant waiting lists. More than half of those who die while patiently waiting for their gift of life are people of color.

The Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act establishes grants to States that will be used to assist in carrying out organ donation awareness, public education and outreach activities, and programs designed to increase the number of organ donors within a State.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill directs the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality to conduct studies to ensure that efforts to increase organ donation and improve the recovery, preservation and transportation of donated organs are not done in vain.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3926, and I am proud to stand here and to say that this is something that we should do and we should do it right away.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this really is a bright day for the U.S. House of Representatives because today, with the passage of this bill, we will expedite the abilities of Americans to give the gift of life. It is not every day that we do something in the House of Representatives that can allow people to live, allow people that are now on waiting lists, waiting this morning to get an e-mail to come in and get their liver transplant or their heart transplant, that we are going to pass a bill today that will allow people to make a decision to actually give the gift of life; and I think that is a pretty good thing to be pleased about in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The part I would like to talk about just briefly about this bill is a portion of a bill that Floyd Spence, our great Republican colleague from South Carolina, who I introduced a portion of this bill with back in 2000. Floyd, when we introduced this bill, was the longest living double heart/lung transplant in America, and I hope that this will shine on his memory with the passage of this bill today. Because what this bill will do will create an organ donor coordinator position in hospitals.

It will be largely federally funded, and where we have put organ coordinators in hospitals, we have found we actually doubled the rate of donation de-

isions made by families, because it allows families the confidence and the knowledge and the coordination with doctors and nursing staff to make this decision.

So this bill, we believe, is going to significantly increase a number of people who get that great call in the morning saying, come on down for your new liver and a new lease on life with 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 new years of life that people are going to have in this country because this bill is going to pass.

Just to put a personal face on this if I can, and let me tell my colleagues why I feel so passionately about this. I want to introduce my colleagues to a friend of mine, Chris Klug. This was taken about 2 years ago when we started working on this bill. Scott, in the year 2000, had a problem where he lost his liver function, and Scott did not have a lot of time to live when he got a new liver transplant.

Just to show my colleagues how successful these organ transplants can be, Scott, just 2 years later after getting a new liver, went on to get a Bronze Medal in the slalom snow-boarding Olympic championship in 2002. That is a pretty amazing thing that this gift of life not only gives a gift of life, but it gives a gift of the tremendous life that Scott is now engaged in. We can see him on these snow-boarding competitions on occasion.

The second person I want to tell my colleagues a little story about is, yesterday morning I was at the University of Washington Medical School in Seattle, Washington, and I was talking to Dr. Robert Carithers and Dr. Connie Davis, who had been involved in one of the premier transplant centers in the United States. They introduced me to a general named Henry Durnil.

Henry is a fellow who works making sure that our navy ships are in good shape at the naval port in Everett, Washington, and some time ago, Henry's liver started to fail him. He got a call Saturday saying, come on in, get your new liver, and I got to meet Henry who was lying in bed. I have got to tell my colleagues if my colleagues saw the smile on Henry Durnil's face and we heard him talking about the miracle of getting a new lease on life, my colleagues will both vote for this bill and they will be happy to spread the gospel of helping others to make the donation decision, because Henry told me that he felt this was truly a miracle. He thanked his nurse, Susan Moore, and the whole transplant team at the University of Washington.

□ 1445

I am happy we are going to pass this bill so there will be more people with Henry's story to tell.

I want to make a special plea to those who are considering this bill, and may be candidates to be organ donors. There are 80,000-plus people who are in the position of Scott Bennett, whom I also met yesterday at the Washington University Medical School. Scott Bennett has climbed Mount Ranier a few

times. He has a heart ailment and has been on a waiting list for a heart for over 4 years.

I would also like to mention Jack Slater, who is a teacher for Seattle public schools who has been writing a diary in the Seattle newspapers about his experience.

Mr. Speaker, we have over 80,000 people like Scott and Jack on a waiting list. This is a step we are going to take today to get the Jacks and the Scotts of the world in a position like the Chris Klugs of the world back doing healthy active lives.

To let Members know how active they can be, we are trying to get the Organ Donation Transplant Athletic Games in Seattle in 2006.

I want to make a couple of points in general that are important in this issue of donation.

Number one, it is very important for people to realize that all of us are both prospective donors and recipients. I can tell Members how we are all prospective recipients, because a year after I started working on this bill, my son developed a congenital eye condition and ended up getting his sight restored due to a cornea transplant. So all of us can be recipients.

But most importantly, we can all be donors. It does not matter how old you are, your race, where you live; all of us can give the gift of life.

There is a fellow named Jamie Moyer, who is an All-Star pitcher for the Seattle Mariners. He is going to be the starting pitcher this year, and he has been an advocate for organ donation issues. Not all of us can pitch like Jamie Moyer, but all of us can be donors to give the gift of life; and I hope people will think about that in their own personal lives.

Secondly, if someone wants to be a donor, it is very important to talk to your family because your family is essentially involved in the decision at that particular moment, and it is very important to let your family know about your wishes because your family needs to convey your wishes to the hospital at the right time. I hope people will talk to their families about this issue and we can make sure that we help more folks on the road back to recovery.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman BILIRAKIS), who has shown great leadership on this issue. This is a great bipartisan effort, and the wonderful story that we can tell as we go home to our constituents this weekend is to say that we can give the gift of life. It is a good day for the House of Representatives and America.

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

I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) for his moving statement about how important this is. I think he really summed it up. I also thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentleman

from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and of course the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and many, many other Members who made this a reality. And I would like to thank the staff that also worked on this bill, because this is life-saving legislation. I think when it comes to saving lives, I think we should try to move as quickly as possible. I hope we can move this bill through the House and it becomes law, and we can make certain that we save lives of people.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act. This bill will potentially save hundreds of thousands of lives over the next decade, by helping increase enrollment in organ donation programs, and making it easier for vital organs to get to the people who so desperately need them.

According to Department of Health and Human Services data, 68 people receive life-saving organ transplantation every day. This is truly a miracle of modern science, turning tragedy into hope for a suffering individual. I commend our health professionals and scientists for their excellent work in making this happen. However, the true heroes are the millions of Americans who take the time to educate themselves on organ donation, and sign up to give the gift of life, in the case they lose their own lives. Checking the organ donor box on one's driver's license is a small but noble gesture that I hope every American makes.

The problem is that not everyone does. Everyday 18 people die while on the waiting list for an organ donation—more than 6500 per year. Before they dies, they often spend years suffering with failing organs, and tens or even hundreds of thousands of dollars in hospital bills, or on dialysis. It is tragic that in a country with top-quality surgeons, with state-of-the-art facilities, that so many people on the waiting list and their families must continue to suffer.

H.R. 3926 will take some smart steps to mitigate the problem. First the bill will provide travel and housing expenses for people who choose to donate their organs while living, such as a kidney, or bone marrow. This is a heroic sacrifice, and deserves our endorsement. Often hours are matched with recipients far from home. Of course, health insurance pays for the medical procedures involved with the transplantation, but the donor is often forced to pay for their own travel costs. That could keep some people from deciding to give. This bill will reimburse non-medical travel and lodging costs to make donation more likely.

The bill will also provide grants for efforts to raise public awareness of the need for the organ donors, and to increase enrollment. If we can get a burst of enrollments, and shorten the organ waiting list, we could get rid of this tragic problem once and for all.

The bill also makes important investments to help our hospitals and organ procurement agencies better able to handle organs and get them to the people who need them. Finally, the bill will require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to produce a report every two years, describing our progress in improving our organ donation record—where we are succeeding and where we need further work.

H.R. 3926 will authorize \$25 million dollars per year for those life-saving programs. It is an excellent investment that will ultimately

save millions of dollars in care for people on the organ waiting list, and prevent years of suffering, or even death.

I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3926, the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act, of which I am a cosponsor. Let me just mention several numbers, that for me, say it all about why we need incentives to increase organ donations across the nation. In Michigan, as of the first of this month, 2544 individuals are on the waiting list for an organ donation. Since the first of the year, 108 individuals received a donated organ and, sadly, 19 people have already died because there was no organ available to save them. These are our constituents, our families, our friends. I know the Transplant Society of Michigan, our state's organ procurement organization, is working hard to increase donations. But they could use a helping hand, as could OPOs across the nation. The Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act we will vote on today is a very good start.

The key to donation is public education and awareness. This legislation gives the Secretary of Health and Human Services the ability to award grants to States for the purpose of assisting States in carrying out organ donor awareness, public education and outreach activities designed to increase the number of organ donors. While there is a desperate need for vital human organs, the American public should know that there is also a continuing need for donated human eyes and tissue. Donation is the term used to describe the humanitarian act of giving to help another. Anatomical gifts include vital, life-saving human organs, sight restoring eyes, and repair and reconstruction human tissue such as bone, cartilage, tendons, skin, and heart valves.

At national, state, and local levels, a partnership exists between the organ, eye and tissue bank communities. While all three communities are considered separate, given differences in medical criteria, training needs and distribution pathways, they are united in their message to encourage the act of donation. Organ donation saves lives, eye donation restores sight, and tissue donation provides skin grafts for critically injured burn patients and benefits thousands of patients in need of bone, cartilage, tendons, and heart valves. Without a donor, transplant surgeons cannot save or improve the health of even one individual.

The intent of H.R. 3926 is primarily to address the shortage of solid human organs. It must be noted, however, that the eye and tissue banking communities are also partners in donation and that their participation and contribution in the donation process is critical to the continued health and well being of many Americans who have either been injured or are suffering from a disease. It is my understanding that it was our intent in crafting H.R. 3926 that specialists in the eye and tissue fields, as well as the organ field, should be consulted and included in the development and dissemination of educational materials on donation. It is my further understanding that it is our intent in this legislation that eye banks and tissue banks be participants in the development of hospital-based donations and protocols that have an impact on eye and tissue banking—as is currently the case under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Every individual can sign-up to be a donor, regardless of health or medical condition. It is imperative, however, that individuals openly discuss their decision to donate with family and friends so that they may help honor their loved one's wishes and are knowledgeable about their options. Just one individual can save and improve as many as 50 lives. Representatives of hospitals, organ banks, eye banks, and tissue banks work hand in hand to see that loved ones' wishes are respected and that gifts are properly handled for the benefit of others. I commend these organizations for working tirelessly toward this end and for their efforts to educate the public on the benefits of donation.

In closing, I fully encourage all Americans to consider the altruistic act of donation and to make others aware of your decision.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act.

The need for human organs for donation has long been a silent crisis, one that rarely hits the headlines but can have a tremendous impact on thousands of patients and their families. Medical advances and the generosity of organ and tissue donors enable more than 22,000 Americans per year to receive organ transplants that save or enhance their lives. But despite the self-sacrifice and charity of so many donors, more than 84,000 Americans are currently on a waiting list, hoping to prolong their lives by finding a matching donor.

Tragically, the number of patients waiting for organ transplants rose more than five times as fast as the number of transplant operations in the 1990s, according to an annual report by the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS). As a result, about 5,500 people die in the United States each year (or 15 patients each day) while waiting for a donated heart, liver, kidney, or other organ. Every 16 minutes, a new name is added to this growing waiting list.

These numbers are indeed concerning, and they should merit greater attention. Each number represents a person—a human being with a family, friends, and a future, and I have met with several of them who live in central New Jersey. We need to do everything we can to ensure that they get access to the organs that could very well save their lives.

As one who carries an organ donor card and has discussed organ donation with his family, I urge all of my colleagues to consider taking similar steps. This action can mean the difference between life and death for someone in need of an organ transplant.

I am glad to see that the House is considering the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act, which would help improve access to organs by implementing a public awareness campaign, reimbursing expenses for organ donors, and authorizing grants to help hospitals coordinate their efforts with organ procurement organizations.

While this legislation deserves our wholehearted support, it is also important to remember that the need for sustained investments in biomedical research and development at the NIH and in the basic science research, at agencies like the NSF, that creates the knowledge base needed to move ahead with medical research. Investing in R&D is about more than just giving jobs to scientists—it's about saving lives and improving the quality of life for countless Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act and to remember the importance of supporting biomedical and basic science research.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the other side of the aisle for moving this bill so quickly, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3926.

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. ROGERS of Michigan. 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.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING HEART DISEASE AMONG WOMEN

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 522) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there is a critical need to increase awareness and education about heart disease and the risk factors of heart disease among women.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 522

Whereas heart disease is the number one killer of American women;

Whereas heart attack, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases claim the lives of more than half a million women each year;

Whereas heart disease takes the lives of more women than men;

Whereas according to a recent American Heart Association survey, only 13 percent of women consider heart disease their greatest health threat;

Whereas one in three women dies of heart disease;

Whereas heart disease kills almost twice as many women as all forms of cancer;

Whereas African-Americans are at greater risk for heart disease and stroke than Caucasians, affecting African-American females at a rate of 39.6 percent compared to 23.8 percent in Caucasian females;

Whereas heart disease and stroke are the leading causes of death for Hispanics, and responsible for 33 percent of deaths in Hispanic females;

Whereas heart disease risk factors include family history, smoking, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, overweight/obesity, physical inactivity, and diabetes; and

Whereas women are often unaware of the risk and receive fewer preventive services than recommended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that there is a critical need to increase awareness and education

about heart disease and the risk factors for heart disease among women, and the House of Representatives—

(1) commends First Lady Laura Bush and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute in their vital campaign to raise public awareness that heart disease is the number one killer of American women;

(2) believes that heart disease will remain the number one killer of American women unless we as a society dramatically improve education, preventative care, research, diagnostic capabilities, and treatments; and

(3) recognizes that the more women become cognizant of the scourge of heart disease and how to prevent it, the more likely they can make sound lifestyle changes to help reduce their chances of getting heart disease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 522.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 522 to express the sense of the House of Representatives that there is a critical need to increase awareness and education about heart disease and the risk factors for heart disease among women.

Heart disease is the number one killer of women, killing almost twice as many as all forms of cancer. Yet according to a recent survey conducted by the American Heart Association, only 13 percent of women consider heart disease their greatest health risk. Lack of knowledge and awareness of symptoms of heart disease is dangerous and can be easily addressed.

This resolution goes right to this point. It encourages all women to recognize the dangers of this disease and take steps to make healthy choices that can reduce the risk of heart disease in the first place. Men and women alike are far more likely to make sound life-style changes when they are educated about the risks of heart disease.

This resolution also commends First Lady Laura Bush and the Heart, Lung and Blood Institute for the fantastic work they have done in this area to raise public awareness about this disease. The First Lady and the NIH have taken a creative approach with this public education campaign using a variety of different media to get the word out about heart disease. I applaud the work that they have done to heighten awareness of this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 522 and in solidarity with all those who are troubled by the fact that heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular disease claim the lives of more than half a million women each year.

A report released by the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention indicates that, despite major progress in reducing death rates from heart disease and stroke, these conditions contribute substantially to the Nation's health care crisis. According to the CDC, the epidemic of heart disease and stroke can be expected to continue with an increasing burden and widening disparities unless unprecedented public efforts are mounted to arrest and reverse it. With statistics showing that heart disease currently takes the lives of more women than men, and one in three women die of heart disease, a challenge has been placed at the feet of our public health and health care systems.

It is imperative that all that can be done is indeed done to ensure that our mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters are made aware of the risk of heart disease and they receive the quality of care needed to live long, healthy lives.

I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for bringing this problem to our attention because this is a worthwhile cause.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the primary sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I am a middle-aged man; and as a man and as a family doctor, I have known for years that my number one health risk is cardiovascular disease. Blood vessel disease, heart disease and strokes, that is what we mean by cardiovascular disease. But, in fact, heart disease takes the lives of more women than men. A recent American Heart Association survey showed that only 13 percent of American women realize that cardiovascular disease, heart disease and strokes is their number one health threat.

The reality is that nearly 500,000 American women die each year from cardiovascular disease; and, in fact, more women die of cardiovascular disease, heart disease and stroke, than the next seven causes of death, including cancer. Nearly twice as many women in the United States die from heart disease and stroke than from all forms of cancers, including breast cancer.

I have a picture of several of our friends and colleagues from on the Hill, staffers that work for various folks. If you are a young woman, as Sarah is on my staff, over your lifetime, her number one risk for death is from heart disease and stroke. If you are a middle-aged woman, your number one cause of death is heart disease and stroke. If you are an African American woman,

as Stacie is, your number one cause of death is heart disease and stroke. And, in fact, more African American women by percentage die of heart disease and stroke than Caucasian. Again, if you are a young woman, over your lifetime, your number one cause of death is heart disease and stroke. If you are Hispanic, your number one cause of death over your lifetime is heart disease and stroke.

So what do you do about this? We spend a lot of time on this House floor talking and worrying about health policy. We talk about the insured and how do we take care of our men and women in uniform and their health care needs, what to do about the Veterans Administration and meeting the needs of veterans; but the reality is for most of us, a lot of what we can do in our health, we control.

So you look at the risk factors. Women smoke too much. Women are like men, they smoke too much, they are too inactive, do not pay enough attention to their blood pressure and diet; and they do not do a good enough job of diagnosing and controlling diabetes. Those are the main risk factors for heart disease.

What this resolution is about, it does not do anything. This is a sense of the House. This does not change law. What it does is give us a chance as Members to talk to women and Americans about this very real risk. First Lady Laura Bush has been doing that. The National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute has been doing that. What we can now do with this resolution is educate our constituents back home, women, that their number one health threat is heart disease and stroke.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), the ranking member, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO), who has been active on these issues for a number of years and has been a strong voice in the House of Representatives.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 522, which is an important measure outlining the need for more awareness and education about heart disease, particularly as it affects women. I commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for his initiative and leadership on this important women's health issue.

Like the country as a whole, heart disease is the leading cause of death on my island of Guam. However, heart disease is increasingly becoming an issue for island women, as the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) just pointed out with his statistics among minorities.

□ 1500

In fact, a recent Centers for Disease Control study indicates that heart dis-

ease is responsible for 214 deaths per 100,000 women on Guam. This is a staggering rate, and only through greater awareness and education can we begin to confront this problem.

One of the primary risk factors leading to heart disease in women is diabetes. Studies show that Guam's death rate from diabetes is five times higher than in the mainland. While some diabetes cases can be attributed largely to genetics, type 2 diabetes can be prevented by a combination of early detection and life-style changes.

Other life-style changes that women can make that will help reduce the risk of developing heart disease include paying close attention to blood pressure and cholesterol levels, preventing obesity and reviewing family history. Abstaining from smoking and increasing physical activity have also been shown to reduce the risk of heart disease.

It is very important that we, as leaders, work hard to educate women that heart disease is not just a health issue for men and that there are many proven life-style changes that women can make to help prevent heart disease. Not only is it important that we as Members of Congress stress the importance of maintaining a healthy life-style to prevent heart disease, but we must continue to support funding to medical researchers and professionals that study these diseases and teachers and public health officials that disseminate such information to women at high risk. Additionally, as studies continue to show, minorities tend to be at greater risk of developing heart disease. We must continue to support studies and uncover the reasons for higher risk in Pacific Islanders and other minorities, and we must provide the necessary resources to ensure parity with regard to education and health care access to high-risk communities.

I congratulate again the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for his hard work on the issue of heart disease among women, and I urge this Congress to not only support House Resolution 522, but to follow through with decisive action.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas for moving this resolution forward. Some people say, well, it's not going to do anything, but I think it does several things.

Number one, I think it makes us focus on the fact that there is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed, and I think that this resolution does that. I think it calls our attention to the fact that there are some serious problems and that we need to address them, and that in order to address them, that we are probably going to need some additional resources in order to do so.

This resolution indicates the fact that it is something that we cannot ignore. We must address the issue and we must address it now.

I would just like to commend him again for the outstanding job that he has done in bringing this matter to our attention.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas, as well, for bringing this to the people of America's attention. It is an incredibly important health risk for women that has gone unnoted for far too long. I thank the gentleman for bringing this important piece of legislation to the forefront and for getting that message out. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) for his cooperation today in reaching across the aisle, really on two pieces of legislation today that will have a positive impact on the health of Americans around the country.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 522, expressing the sense of the House that there is a critical need to increase awareness and education about heart disease and the risk factors of heart disease among women. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

Heart disease is no longer considered a disease that affects just men. In the past, women usually received less aggressive treatment for heart disease and were not referred for diagnostic tests as often. As a result, when many women were finally diagnosed with heart disease, they usually had more advanced disease and their prognosis was poorer. We now know that cardiovascular diseases affect more women than men and are responsible for more than 40 percent of all deaths in American women.

The problem is that most women still don't know that they are vulnerable. Despite the fact that heart disease kills almost twice as many women as all forms of cancer, only 13 percent of women consider heart disease their greatest health threat. Even when cardiovascular disease strikes, many women and even their physicians do not recognize it. For example, Dr. Susan Wilansky, a Texas Heart Institute cardiologist at St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital, stated: "Many women don't exhibit the traditional symptoms of heart disease. Some experience just shortness of breath, extreme fatigue upon exertion, or pain in the jaw or elbow. Women who suspect they are experiencing symptoms of heart disease should be sure to take them seriously."

We need to help get the word out, and this resolution will help. We must especially concentrate on minority and disadvantaged communities who, too often, are at highest risk. African-Americans, are at greater risk for heart disease and stroke than Caucasians, affecting African-American females at a rate of 39.6 percent compared to 23.8 percent in Caucasian females. Heart disease and stroke are the leading causes of death for Hispanics, and responsible for 33 percent of deaths in Hispanic females.

I commend the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute and First Lady Laura Bush for their vital work to raise public awareness that heart disease is the number one killer of American women. I am glad to see that Congress is now recognizing the problem. I hope

that we will see this same level of commitment in the budget and appropriations process later this year. It is time to take this problem head-on.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 522.

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. ROGERS of Michigan. 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 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) 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 the Speaker's approval of the Journal and on three motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

The Speaker's approval of the Journal, de novo;

H.R. 958, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2408, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2489, by the yeas and nays.

The votes on H.R. 3926 and House Resolution 522 will be taken tomorrow.

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

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 26, answered "present" 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]
YEAS—380

Abercrombie	Cooper	Hayes
Ackerman	Cox	Hayworth
Aderholt	Cramer	Hensarling
Akin	Crenshaw	Herger
Alexander	Crowley	Hill
Allen	Cubin	Hinchey
Andrews	Cummings	Hobson
Baca	Cunningham	Hoekstra
Baird	Davis (AL)	Holden
Baker	Davis (CA)	Holt
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Honda
Ballance	Davis (IL)	Hooley (OR)
Ballenger	Davis (TN)	Hostettler
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Houghton
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Tom	Hoyer
Barton (TX)	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Bass	DeGette	Hyde
Beauprez	Delahunt	Inslée
Becerra	DeLauro	Isakson
Bell	DeLay	Israel
Bereuter	DeMint	Issa
Berkley	Deutsch	Istook
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson (IL)
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson-Lee
Biggert	Dicks	(TX)
Bilirakis	Dingell	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Jenkins
Bishop (NY)	Dooley (CA)	John
Bishop (UT)	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Blackburn	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Blunt	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Boehlert	Dunn	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Bonilla	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bonner	Emanuel	Kaptur
Bono	Emerson	Keller
Boozman	Engel	Kelly
Boswell	Etheridge	Kennedy (RI)
Boucher	Evans	Kildee
Boyd	Everett	Kilpatrick
Bradley (NH)	Farr	Kind
Brady (PA)	Feeney	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	King (NY)
Brown (OH)	Flake	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Foley	Kirk
Brown, Corrine	Forbes	Klecza
Brown-Waite,	Ford	Kline
Ginny	Fossella	Knollenberg
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kolbe
Burns	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Burton (IN)	Frost	LaHood
Buyer	Gallegly	Lampson
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Langevin
Camp	Gerlach	Lantos
Cannon	Gibbons	Larsen (WA)
Cantor	Gilchrest	Larson (CT)
Capito	Gingrey	LaTourrette
Capps	Gonzalez	Leach
Cardin	Goode	Levin
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Carson (IN)	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Carson (OK)	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Granger	Linder
Case	Graves	Lipinski
Castle	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Chabot	Greenwood	Lofgren
Chandler	Grijalva	Lowe
Chocola	Gutierrez	Lucas (KY)
Clay	Hall	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Harman	Lynch
Cole	Harris	Majette
Collins	Hastings (FL)	Maloney
Conyers	Hastings (WA)	Manzullo

Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce

NAYS—26

Capuano
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green (TX)
Gutknecht

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancred

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Burr
Clyburn
Culberson
Eshoo
Fattah
Gephardt
Gillmor
Hinojosa

□ 1854

Mr. CRANE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 72, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES
AMENDMENTS OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 958, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 958, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 23, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—384

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
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
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer

Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell

NAYS—23

Akin
Bartlett (MD)
Blackburn
Coble
Collins
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Everett

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Boswell
Burr
Clyburn
Cox
Culberson
Eshoo
Fattah
Gephardt

□ 1905

Mr. WAMP changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE
VOLUNTEER ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2408, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2408, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 10, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Cole	Greenwood
Ackerman	Collins	Grijalva
Aderholt	Conyers	Gutierrez
Akin	Cooper	Gutknecht
Alexander	Costello	Hall
Allen	Cox	Harman
Andrews	Cramer	Harris
Baca	Crane	Hart
Bachus	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Baker	Cubin	Hayes
Baldwin	Cummings	Hayworth
Ballance	Cunningham	Hefley
Ballenger	Davis (AL)	Herger
Barrett (SC)	Davis (CA)	Hill
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (FL)	Hinchey
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Bass	Davis (TN)	Hobson
Beauprez	Davis, Jo Ann	Hoekstra
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Holden
Bell	Deal (GA)	Holt
Bereuter	DeFazio	Honda
Berkley	DeGette	Hooley (OR)
Berman	Delahunt	Hostettler
Berry	DeLauro	Houghton
Biggart	DeLay	Hoyer
Billirakis	DeMint	Hunter
Bishop (GA)	Deutsch	Hyde
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Inslee
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Isakson
Blackburn	Dicks	Israel
Blumenauer	Dingell	Issa
Blunt	Doggett	Istook
Boehlert	Dooley (CA)	Jackson (IL)
Boehner	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Bonilla	Doyle	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Bonner	Dreier	Jefferson
Bono	Dunn	Jenkins
Boozman	Edwards	John
Boswell	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Emanuel	Johnson (IL)
Boyd	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Bradley (NH)	Engel	Jones (OH)
Brady (PA)	English	Kanjorski
Brady (TX)	Etheridge	Kaptur
Brown (OH)	Evans	Keller
Brown (SC)	Everett	Kelly
Brown, Corrine	Farr	Kennedy (MN)
Brown-Waite,	Feeney	Kennedy (RI)
Ginny	Ferguson	Kildee
Burgess	Filner	Kilpatrick
Burns	Foley	Kind
Burton (IN)	Forbes	King (IA)
Buyer	Ford	King (NY)
Calvert	Fossella	Kingston
Camp	Frank (MA)	Kirk
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Klecicka
Cantor	Frost	Kline
Capito	Galleghy	Knollenberg
Capps	Garrett (NJ)	Kolbe
Capuano	Gerlach	Kucinich
Cardin	Gibbons	LaHood
Cardoza	Gilchrest	Lampson
Carson (IN)	Gingrey	Langevin
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Lantos
Carter	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Case	Gordon	Larson (CT)
Castle	Goss	Latham
Chabot	Granger	LaTourrette
Chandler	Graves	Leach
Chocola	Green (TX)	Lee
Clay	Green (WI)	Levin

Lewis (CA)	Otter
Lewis (GA)	Owens
Lewis (KY)	Oxley
Linder	Pallone
Lipinski	Pascarell
LoBiondo	Pastor
Lofgren	Payne
Lowey	Pearce
Lucas (KY)	Pelosi
Lucas (OK)	Pence
Lynch	Peterson (MN)
Majette	Petri
Maloney	Pickering
Manzullo	Pitts
Markey	Platts
Marshall	Pombo
Matheson	Pomeroy
McCarthy (MO)	Porter
McCarthy (NY)	Portman
McCollum	Price (NC)
McCotter	Pryce (OH)
McCrary	Putnam
McDermott	Quinn
McGovern	Radanovich
McHugh	Rahall
McInnis	Ramstad
McIntyre	Rangel
McNulty	Regula
Meehan	Rehberg
Meek (FL)	Renzi
Meeks (NY)	Reyes
Menendez	Reynolds
Hall	Mica
Harman	Michaud
Harris	Millender-
Hart	McDonald
Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Hayes	Miller (NC)
Hayworth	Miller, Gary
Hefley	Miller, George
Herger	Moore
Hill	Moran (KS)
Hinchey	Moran (VA)
Hinojosa	Murphy
Hobson	Murtha
Hoekstra	Musgrave
Holden	Myrick
Holt	Nadler
Honda	Napolitano
Hooley (OR)	Neal (MA)
Hostettler	Neugebauer
Houghton	Ney
Hoyer	Northup
Hunter	Norwood
Hyde	Nunes
Inslee	Nussle
Isakson	Oberstar
Israel	Obey
Issa	Olver
Istook	Ortiz
Jackson (IL)	Osborne
Jackson-Lee	Ose

NAYS—10

Coble	Goode
Duncan	Goode
Flake	Hensarling
Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
	Jones (NC)

NOT VOTING—22

Burr	Hulshof	Stark
Clyburn	Matsui	Tauzin
Culberson	McKeon	Toomey
Eshoo	Mollohan	Waters
Fattah	Nethercutt	Wexler
Gephardt	Peterson (PA)	Wynn
Gillmor	Rodriguez	
Hoefel	Simmons	

□ 1914

Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. GOODE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE DISTRIBUTION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2489, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2489, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—404

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

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

NOT VOTING—29

Burr	Gillmor	Rodriguez
Chandler	Hoeffel	Simmons
Clyburn	Hookey (OR)	Smith (MI)
Collins	Hulshof	Stark
Culberson	Matsui	Tauzin
Davis (FL)	McKeon	Toomey
Eshoo	Mollohan	Waters
Evans	Murtha	Wexler
Fattah	Nethercutt	Wynn
Gephardt	Peterson (PA)	

□ 1921

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3633

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3633.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 393, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time for the Speaker, as though pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, to declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. Con.Res. 393, and that consideration of the concurrent resolution proceed according to the following order:

the first reading of the concurrent resolution is dispensed with;

all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived;

general debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed 6 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, provided that 1 hour of such debate shall be on the subject of economic goals and policies, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) or their designees;

After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion; and

No further consideration of H. Con. Res. 393 shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

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

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 3997, CONVEYANCE OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND IN STATE OF ARKANSAS, TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3997 and that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on Resources.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I was unavoidably absent

from the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 66 and 67, and "yes" on rollcall 68, 69, 70, and 71.

U.S. MUST REMAIN ENGAGED IN ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CRISIS

(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, one really does not know where to begin. In February of 2001, I went to the floor of the House and literally begged the President of the United States, duly inaugurated, to remain engaged in the Palestinian and Israeli crisis. The response of the administration at that time was let them fight it out. So I again come to this floor and indicate that if we are to have peace in the Mideast, the United States of America must be engaged in a reconciliation and a resolution of that crisis. Lives are being lost, futures are being denied, because we are not engaged in activating either the road map or an opportunity for there to be peace negotiations in that region.

Then, Mr. Speaker, might I comment very briefly on an editorial by Governor Jeb Bush that indicted the Congressional Black Caucus because of its concern for Haiti and its concern for a duly democratically elected leader. I would ask Governor Bush to take and pay attention to democracy in his State so that he will be able to have standing to criticize anybody who wants to support democracy in Haiti.

PASS CRANE-RANGEL FOR INCREASED INCENTIVES FOR MANUFACTURING

(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 was in my home State of Ohio in Cleveland near my district a week or so ago trying to justify his economic policy. Ohio has lost 300,000 jobs since President Bush took office. That is 2,000 jobs a week, 260 jobs every day. One out of six manufacturing jobs has simply disappeared in Ohio.

His response is more tax cuts for the most wealthy in society, with trickle-down economics, hoping that it might create some jobs and trade agreements that ship more jobs overseas. It is not working.

Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives should pass the Crane-Rangel bill, which will give incentives to American manufacturing to grow their manufacturing jobs here. This Congress should pass that instead of what President Bush has tried: old trickle-down economics, which is not working.

SPECIAL ORDERS

□ 1930

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.

AMERICANS SUPPORT 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, in April of 2003, James Oo-jamuh of Seattle pleaded guilty to charges of conspiracy to help al Qaeda. He planned to train terrorists in Oregon. According to one recruit, members of the cell brought AK-47s, pistols, and other assault rifles, enough for anybody and then some.

Mr. Speaker, assault weapons will go back on our streets in 174 days, that is, September 14. If we do not bring the bill up for a vote here on the House floor, it will expire; and we will be back where we were 10 years ago. That is good news for terrorists and other criminals, but bad news for American families and communities and our police officers.

Since I came to the floor to talk about gun violence last week, almost 400 people have died in the past week to gun violence in this country. Simply put, assault weapons were designed to kill as many people as possible as quickly as possible, and we want them back on our streets? Where in God's name do we understand that kind of an attitude? That sounds like the perfect weapon for a terrorist whose goal is to create as much death and fear as possible.

Following the fall of Kabul in November of 2001, a document was found in a safe house advising those that were training where to buy the guns: go to America and buy all the guns you can. It is also known that during the 1980s al Qaeda purchased dozens of advanced sniper rifles for use in the Afghan war against the Russians.

Since going into effect in 1994, the Assault Weapons Ban has increased public safety and prevented dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

There are those who wish to see this critical and commonplace public safety measure die a quiet death. The American people support this ban. Our law enforcements across this Nation support this ban.

During the 2000 year election, then-Governor Bush, now President Bush, promised he would sign the bill if it went on his desk. Well, that, unfortunately, is the trick. Unless we have a vote on it here, it is never going to get on his desk. It is up to the American people to use their right to have their voices heard. All they have to do is call the two bodies, call the White House and say, we want to have an assault weapons ban in place.

Let me say this: Ten years ago I was not in Congress. Ten years ago I was back home in Mineola. I was a nurse, and something happened to my family. They were shot with many others on the Long Island Rail Road. That is when I woke up to the gun violence in this country.

I promised that I would do whatever I could to reduce gun violence in this country, and the first thing I started working on was the assault weapons ban. If we do not approve this, it is going to die.

Large capacity clips, our police officers are allowed to use them, our military men are allowed to use them. Our hunters are not allowed to use them. Hunters give animals a better chance of surviving than we allow people. Clips that have 15 bullets in it. Well, we can go back to the old days, 20, 30, 40.

Why in God's name do we need these particular guns on our streets again?

Please, I am asking the American people, have your voices heard. I hear continuously they feel they have no voice in government. You can have a voice in government. You can make a difference. One person can make a difference. How many votes have we had here on the House floor where it is won or lost by one vote?

I am asking the American people to get involved in this. Please. We can make a difference.

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

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

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

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

TAX CUTS IMPROVE ECONOMY

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 I spoke about a Tennessee report showing 15,647 new corporations, LLCs and limited partnership registrations in my State. That was the best ever, the best on record. The tax cuts that President Bush and Congress passed are clearly giving those with the entrepreneurial spirit the room to take that leap and form new businesses. This is what America is all about, living out that American dream.

And today I have more good news. This time from the Nashville Tennessee Business Section that

speaks to the growth that this Republican tax relief is helping to generate.

Democrats and candidate JOHN KERRY say the Bush tax cuts are not working, that they will repeal the Bush tax cuts and raise your tax bill so that they can fund more government spending. Well, I would like to recommend that they just hold on a minute before the Democrats rally around tax increases.

They should read this article. "Businesses Using Tax Cuts to Get While Gettin's Good." This is from the Nashville Tennessean. "Businesses Using Tax Cuts to Get While the Gettin's Good." This is what we said would happen with tax cuts, businesses would grow.

Now the article is about John Aron, a business owner in Nashville. He runs The Pasta Shop, and his story is a testament to the Bush tax relief. Mr. Aron wanted to expand his business, but the cost of new equipment was nearly \$81,000. After looking at the President's tax relief package that this Congress passed last year, and it gives businesses a tax break on equipment purchases, Mr. Aron went ahead and made the investment and expensed 57 percent of his equipment costs this year, saving his company \$35,000 on his 2003 taxes.

Well, guess what he did next? He hired two employees. This is exactly what Republicans said would happen if we lowered the taxes.

Now, some across the aisle are saying, well, that is just one story and it cannot be a trend; but let me give you a few more examples. Brad Blevins spent \$100,000 for a metal stamping machine for his company. He'll save \$30,000 in taxes. Business grows.

Rivergate Partners in Nashville spending \$350,000 on their 50,000-square-foot building. They will save \$60,000. Business is growing.

Richards & Richards, able to write off \$100,000 worth of storage shelving for their offices.

Get the point? Businesses are growing because of the tax relief. Mr. Aron said, "The Bush tax cuts substantially reduced the risk of entry."

If I were calling for tax increase, I would be feeling a little bit foolish right now for calling for those tax increases.

In 2003, 25 million small business owners saved an average of \$2,853 on their tax bill. That is 25 million small business owners. The President and Republicans supported this relief because we know that it will spur investment and encourage Americans to start new businesses and reach that American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a few misplaced perceptions that have been allowed to go unchallenged far too long. The Democrats have criticized the President. They have slammed his foreign policy, his economic policy, and they often cite Europe as an example of the sort of countries that we ought out emulate.

I beg to differ.

The countries of Europe have created large, extensive welfare systems. They have outrageously high taxes. They tax and spend, all to support growing government social programs. And the result? In December 2003, Belgium had an 8.3 unemployment rate. In January 2004, France, a vocal critic of U.S. economic and foreign policy, had a whopping 9.3 percent unemployment rate. Germany, another consistent critic of the U.S., in January of this year had a 9.1 percent unemployment rate.

Mr. Speaker, in January of 2004 America had a 5.6 percent unemployment rate.

A leftist European model does not work in foreign affairs and it does not work here in economics. Unfortunately and unwisely, Democrats have adopted this kind of approach for their platform.

We have weathered a recession and September 11 with the \$1 trillion impact it had on our economy, and we remain committed to tax relief. And this month the Employer Outlook Survey reported that 28 percent of the 16,000 employers that they surveyed expected to hire more workers from April to June of this year.

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.)

"EXXON VALDEZ" IS NOT THE ONLY SHIP AGROUND

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, America will pause tomorrow to remember the 15th anniversary of the *Exxon Valdez* environmental disaster. On March 24, 1989, the captain in charge of this massive tanker was unfit to command even a row boat, yet the intoxicated captain was at the helm, and he ran the *Valdez* aground in Alaska's fragile and pristine Prince William Sound. Eleven million gallons of oil emptied into the sea and devastated everything in its path. It will take generations, if ever, for there to be a complete recovery.

Fifteen years later, at least 100 tons of toxic waste, concentrated by years of weathering, continues to kill and maim Alaska's environment. Fifteen years later, thousands of Alaskans continue to wait for the \$5 billion a jury ordered Exxon to pay. The money remains in Exxon's pocket. Exxon would rather buy time and influence than pay what amounted to 1 year of profits for an environmental catastrophe.

Sound familiar?

It should.

The President's proposed budget hemorrhages red ink about as fast as

the *Exxon Valdez* gushed oil into the Prince William Sound, and the consequences are just as devastating. This President has run the U.S. economy aground with the same disregard for protecting ordinary Americans as a drunken captain had one night for protecting Alaska's environment. It will take generations, if ever, for there to be a complete recovery.

Here is the damage report from the scene.

The President rewards our soldiers returning from Iraq by increasing fees for medical service in his budget. Welcome home, soldiers. Get out your checkbooks.

The administration orders universal health care for everyone in Iraq, but not America. Administration officials claim everyone in America already has health coverage. That will come as a surprise to 44 million Americans.

The person who knew the prescription drug bill would cost \$139 billion more than the administration said it would, he was told he would be fired if he released that data. If only Supreme Court Justice Scalia were a Member of the House, he might lead the Republicans in a great "Quack, Quack" when the drug bill passed on quack data.

Perhaps we should have heard a similar refrain when the administration decided that flipping hamburgers was a manufacturing job. Perhaps the President should have declared, "Quack, Quack" when the administration rewarded corporate buddies by throwing out the rule book for overtime pay for ordinary Americans.

The average American is a sitting duck for this administration.

Millions of Americans are drowning in a sea of unemployment, but the administration refuses to throw a lifeline by extending unemployment benefits.

Average Americans received an average cut of \$676. Millionaire Americans received an average cut of \$112,925. This must be an example of the compassion the President says motivates him every day.

Big oil gets invited to secret meetings conducted by the Vice President to map out a future energy policy for America. Somehow, I do not think they talked at all about the *Exxon Valdez* or the money Exxon owes the people of Alaska for their drunken sailor.

I could be wrong, but we may never know because the administration refuses to tell America what went on behind closed doors.

Speaking of doors, they are slamming shut on average Americans at an alarming rate. Interest rates are at a record low. Mortgage foreclosures, personal bankruptcy and credit card delinquencies are either rising or are at record highs.

I wonder if we will hear a "Quack, Quack" from the White House on that one? Probably not. Duck hunting, after all, is best done on private lands owned by oil companies with the Vice President leading a Supreme Court Justice who has elevated duck calls to a Supreme Court decision.

How much things change. How much they stay the same.

The *Exxon Valdez* ran aground when there was a President Bush in the White House. The U.S. economy ran aground when there was a President Bush in the White House. The *Exxon Valdez* caused the greatest environmental catastrophe in history when it ran aground. Our President Bush, Bush II, may trump that with the largest economic catastrophe in history when he ran America aground.

HONORING THE CONGRESSIONAL HISPANIC CONFERENCE

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the first anniversary of the Congressional Hispanic Conference. Formed just 1 year ago, the Conference promotes the interest of over 40 million Americans of Hispanic and Portuguese descent. As an associate member of this Conference, along with our founding members, we have provided a needed voice in Congress and in issues important to the Hispanic and Latino community.

Hispanics, by principle, value moderate and conservative beliefs, and the Congressional Hispanic Conference's policy objectives mirror those beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe "Los valores le los Hispanos son los valores de los Republicanos," meaning "Hispanic values are Republican values."

When you address the issues, it is clear that the values of the Republican Party are the values of Hispanic and Latino Americans.

In the 108th Congress, the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003, known by most as the "Bush tax cut," was passed and signed by George W. Bush. This legislation lowered taxes for every American taxpayer, and now several million working Americans of low income benefit from a new lower tax bracket of 10 percent, allowing them to keep more of what they earned. But also note, these hard-working Americans in the lowest tax bracket receive the largest percentage reduction in their tax burden. In fact, 3 million low-income families no longer have to pay Federal income taxes.

Another benefit of the Bush tax cut to strengthen families is that we increased the child tax credit from \$600 to \$1,000 per child this year. An estimated 34 million families benefit from this provision to help them. And I would note that we also strengthen families and, particularly, the institution of marriage by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

The Congressional Hispanic Conference is committed to passing legislation which provides common-sense lower taxes for all Americans.

With the No Child Left Behind Act designed to help our schools passed by this Congress, signed into law by President Bush, minority parents are empowered with the freedom to remove

their children from unsafe and failing schools and enroll them into a more successful institution. Ensuring that Hispanics receive a quality education will assist bridging the wage and unemployment gap that exists here in America.

□ 1945

We have all learned that with higher education workers can earn more income with their jobs; and I would also note, with our commitment to education in the Republican Congress, when we worked with the President over the last 3½ years, we have increased Federal funding for education by 45 percent over just 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, these are just two examples of numerous legislative accomplishments of the Congressional Hispanic Conference, along with the Republican majority. The list continues, whether the issue is the Republican effort to increase the number of community health centers and access to health care, to lower taxes to strengthen and make our schools better, to support faith-based community organizations, or promote homeownership and develop a common market for all of the Americas.

Republicans, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and President Bush have worked hard to make our messages of support clear to our Latino and Hispanic communities and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve as an associate member of the Congressional Hispanic Conference and commend the conference for a successful year in just 1 year. My colleagues and I will continue to promote the goals and aspirations of the Latino community and the opportunities for all Americans.

Los valores de los Hispanos son los valores de los Republicanos. Compartimos los mismos valores. Somos todos Americanos.

(English translation of the above statement is as follows:)

Hispanic values are Republican values. We share common values. We are all Americans.

TELLING THE TRUTH, FACING THE CONSEQUENCES IN THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, Richard Clark is a career civil servant and registered Republican who served in four administrations: President Reagan, President Bush, President Clinton and now our present President Bush. Most recently, he served for this President as a counterterrorism czar for President George W. Bush.

Apparently, he committed an unforgivable sin on "60 Minutes" Sunday night. In his new book, "Against All

Enemies," Mr. Clark lays out a detailed, factual, substantive critique of the President Bush's failure to adequately address the threat of terrorism and specifically al Qaeda before September 11.

I worked in the Clinton White House. I worked with Dick Clark. We did not always agree on everything; but we never doubted his patriotism, and working for four Presidents, one Democrat and three Republicans, he was committed to this country and to his mission in serving it.

Let me give my colleagues a quote from that show: "I think the way he," that is, the President, "responded to al Qaeda, both before 9/11 by doing nothing, and by what he's done after 9/11 has made us less safe. Absolutely."

"He [President Bush] ignored terrorism for months, when maybe we could have done something to stop 9/11. Maybe. We'll never know."

What has been the consequence? He has been castigated since the newscast aired Sunday night. The White House has attacked him professionally and personally, going to the point of questioning the loyalty and integrity of a man who clearly was not in the business for politics.

But Dick Clark joins a long list of ex-administration officials who have one thing in common: they told the truth. They told the truth in the face of great political pressure and personal risk, knowing they would be attacked for what they said, and this is a long list of people that exited the administration.

This administration prides themselves on having all these MBAs. The first thing you do when you have an MBA is assess the people around you. They have either got the greatest amount of names that have ever been assembled or the greatest amount of truth tellers, but they cannot handle the truth there.

I do not understand how they have hired Richard Foster, current chief Medicare actuary, who wanted to tell the truth about the cost of the prescription drug. Paul O'Neill, former Secretary of Treasury, former chairman of ALCOA, he told the truth about what was happening to America's fiscal house. Joe Wilson, former U.S. Ambassador to Nigeria. Eric Shinseki, retired Army chief of staff. John DiIulio, former White House director of the faith-based initiatives. Anthony Zinni, retired Marine general and President Bush's envoy to the Mideast. Larry Lindsey, the President's former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and now Dick Clark. These people told the truth despite the pressure to otherwise tell the American people the facts. For these acts of simple honesty, they deserve to be called patriots rather than be cast aside and have their patriotism and their professionalism questioned.

Let us review the facts: Richard Foster, current chief Medicare actuary. The truth: the chief Medicare actuary, Richard Foster, revealed the real cost

of the Medicare bill was \$550 billion, not \$400 billion. Consequences: he was warned that the consequences for insubordination are extremely severe if he told the Congress and the American people the truth.

Bruce Buckheit, EPA director for air quality. Truth: Mr. Buckheit said the new mercury standards were written to benefit the administration's corporate friends and polluters. Consequences: five current EPA officials corroborated Buckheit's story, but according to the Los Angeles Times chose to remain anonymous for fear of retribution. Mr. Buckheit resigned in December. EPA Administrator Leavitt is now reexamining the mercury rule and may propose a more stringent one, but he had to leave.

Paul O'Neill, former Secretary of the Treasury. Truth: Secretary O'Neill described in his book, "The Price of Loyalty," that President Bush is distracted, incurious and makes decision on the economy and national security based on poor information or for political motives. He called President Bush "a blind man in a room full of deaf people." He criticized his tax cuts and his plan to invade Iraq since week one. He criticized the tax cuts because he said they would leave America fiscally unsound. We have \$3 trillion additional debt because of these tax cuts. Consequence: it took the White House less than 24 minutes after Mr. O'Neill's "60 Minutes" interview to launch an investigation into his use of "classified" documents and then they fired him. He was actually fired before that.

I will submit the rest of my text into the RECORD herewith.

Joseph C. Wilson—former U.S. Ambassador to Niger.

Truth: In a July 6, 2003, New York Times Op-Ed, Ambassador Wilson challenged the President's claim that Iraq tried to buy uranium ore from Africa. The White House later admitted he was correct and the President's claim shouldn't have appeared in the State of the Union address.

Consequence: According to government sources, Administration officials leaked the name of Ambassador Wilson's wife, an undercover CIA agent, to a journalist. A White House senior official admitted about the leak, "Clearly, it was meant purely and imply for revenge."

General Shinseki—retired Army Chief of Staff.

Truth: Army Chief of Staff General Eric Shinseki told Congress that occupying Iraq would require "several hundred thousand troops."

Consequence: Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz criticized his estimate as "wildly off the mark." Shinseki later resigned.

John Dilulio—former White House Director of Faith Based Initiatives.

Truth: "There is no precedent in any modern White House for what is going on in this one: a complete lack of a policy apparatus," Dilulio told Esquire in January 2003. "What you've got is everything—and I mean everything—being run by the political arm. It's the reign of the Mayberry Machiavellis."

Consequence: Under intense pressure from the White House, Dilulio apologized for his

statement and was forced to say he didn't mean it.

General Zinni—Retired Marine General and President Bush's envoy to the Middle East.

Truth: Zinni, a retired Marine Corps General who was Bush's middle east envoy, told a foreign policy forum before the Iraq war that the Administration had far more pressing policy priorities than Iraq and said there could be a prolonged, difficult occupation after the war.

Consequence: Zinni was not reappointed.

Larry Lindsey—the President's former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

Truth: Larry Lindsey told a newspaper that the Iraq war would cost \$200 billion.

Consequence: The President fired him.

As President Ronald Reagan said, facts are stubborn things. Richard Clarke and the many others we should recognize as Patriots have pulled back the curtain and revealed facts that are not only stubborn, but also inconvenient and damaging to Mr. Bush, the self-described "War President." They told the truth and are now facing the consequences.

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 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 Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take the gentleman from Missouri's (Mr. HULSHOF) time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is entitled to only one 5-minute speech.

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 in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. ROSLEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PALLONE 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 gentle-

woman 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.)

TRIBUTE TO U.S. MARINE CORPORAL DAVID M. VICENTE

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor a true hero, Marine Corporal David M. Vicente, who gave his life in service to this country in Iraq. Corporal Vicente was a resident of Methuen, Massachusetts; and he was deployed with the brave men and women serving in our Armed Forces as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom II.

David arrived in Iraq just 2 weeks ago; and he died tragically on March 19, 2004, when a Humvee in which he was patrolling hit a land mine near the town of Hit, Iraq. David had just celebrated his 25th birthday and was newly engaged to his beloved girlfriend, Alexandria. His friends and family recalled David's knack for fixing things and a fondness for all things mechanical, from remote-control racing cars to his Chevrolet short-bed pickup truck.

Since he was a small child, David Vicente knew what he wanted to be, a United States Marine. While his friends dressed in overalls and T-shirts, David grew up wearing fatigues and combat boots. His friends at Greater Lawrence Technical School never doubted him when David would declare, One day, I want to be a Marine.

David's dream came true when he joined the Marine Corps 6 months prior to the September 11 terrorist attacks on our Nation. He trained as a rifleman while based at Twenty-nine Palms, California, and rose to serve his country valiantly and faithfully as a corporal with the 2nd battalion of the 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division.

David's parents, Orlando and Celeste, are proud of their son, not just for the supreme sacrifice he made on behalf of his country, but for the honor he brought to them as a Marine. The bumper sticker on the family's car affirms their pride, "My son is a United States Marine."

One morning following the tragedy of September 11, Celeste Vicente discovered someone had draped an American flag over their family car. She felt that it was not only touched by her son's service but wanted to honor all of our troops for their courageous efforts on our behalf.

I spoke to Celeste today, and like so many other parents of soldiers who have lost their lives, she expressed concerns about her son and other soldiers not having the equipment, the gear, the technology that they need. I told her today that I am going to work with other Members of the Congress to make sure that we get what our troops need immediately.

Today, I have also requested an American flag be flown over the United States Capitol in memory of Corporal David Vicente to honor his brave service to this country. This flag will be delivered to his family.

David died fighting for the country he loved, alongside comrades that he respected and with the family he adored forever in his heart.

Our Nation is humbled and grateful for his sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, we should all take a moment to recognize Corporal David M. Vicente, United States Marine Corps, who gave his life in service to the country he loved.

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.)

IN MEMORY OF SERGEANT DANNY LONDONO

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, last week this House passed a resolution offering our sincere thanks and this Nation's thanks to our men and women in uniform who have so bravely and brilliantly served the cause of freedom, justice, and democracy in Iraq.

While I fully support that resolution, offering our sincere appreciation to our armed service personnel, I personally wanted to add to those sentiments the great sadness and most profound sense of loss on behalf of the families of those young men and women who have made the supreme sacrifice in the fight against terrorism and tyranny in our time.

It is with such sadness today that I must add the name of Sergeant Danny Londono, from the neighborhood of Dorchester in the city of Boston, which I proudly represent in the Congress, to the list of those who have fought with extreme valor and given their lives for our country.

In my brief time here in the Congress, following the attacks of September 11, I note that we frequently speak of the grandest ideals and the noblest principles on which this country stands; and against the backdrop of world terrorism, it is easy to be persuaded that we are all paying the price equally in some small way to meet the cost of that confrontation between good and evil.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that there are some citizens, like Danny Londono, who are rendering all they have so that others might know freedom; and there are some families, like the Londono family, who are literally carrying this Nation forward on their backs and in their individual grief.

One such citizen soldier is Danny Londono. Sergeant Danny Londono gave his life for his country on the streets of Baghdad about 10 days ago, and one such family who must now bear the terrible grief and sadness is Danny's family.

Danny's family lives on East Cottage Street in Dorchester, Massachusetts, a tightly knit, hard-working neighborhood in Boston. Danny was a graduate of Archbishop Williams High School in Braintree, where he was a member of the track team. He enlisted in the Army straight out of high school and did tours as a foot soldier, as paratrooper, and as sergeant with the 82nd Airborne Division; and at age 22, Danny had served in Kosovo and Afghanistan, as well as Iraq.

Sergeant Londono represents the very best this country has to offer. He was someone who hoped to use his skills and training that he got in the Army to make a better life for himself and his family so he could pay for college and possibly return to his community to serve as a police officer. His tour of duty with the Army would have finished in August.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is enormously proud of Danny Londono. We mourn his loss as we honor his memory. We are all proud of our Armed Forces and the job they are doing today in Iraq, as well as places like Kosovo and Bosnia, Afghanistan, Haiti and elsewhere; but I think it is important that we never lose sight of the individual stories of the soldiers who have given their lives on behalf of this country. For these families, the sacrifice is overwhelming, the sorrow is unspeakable, and the sacrifice is real.

I join with the Members of the House of Representatives in offering our condolences and prayers to Danny Londono and his family.

□ 2000

HELP AMERICA VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, following the election debacle in Florida in the 2000 Presidential race, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act to improve election systems across the country; but lately I have met with many election officials who are largely unaware of what that law actually says, and tonight I would like to clarify some of its provisions.

Importantly, HAVA will make money available to the States for new voting machines, but HAVA does not require States and localities to replace systems if they are satisfied with the ones that they have. All those jurisdictions have to do if they want to keep their equipment is just provide voters with instructions how to correct their ballot if they make a mistake before that bal-

lot is cast and counted. So the law that Congress passed permits paper ballots if jurisdictions want to use them, it permits punch cards, it permits lever machines, it permits a central count voting system. Those are not outlawed. Indeed, I am putting in the RECORD tonight title III, section 301 from that act that explains to local election officials what the law actually says. They should not be afraid. There is no Federal pressure to do what they do not want to do.

Some States have decided to go ahead with replacing equipment before this year's Presidential elections even though there are no standards in place at the Federal level to guarantee if they purchase new machines, particularly electronic machines, that they will be secure. And 23 States, including Ohio, have thus received a waiver and are not required to have new systems in place until the first Federal election in 2006, nearly 2 years from now.

There are problems with new electronic voting machines that we did not know when this legislation was initially passed. Some, particularly the primary sponsors of this legislation, say we should leave it alone. They say let the Election Assistance Commission that was talked about in the law do its work. They say let the National Institute of Standards and Technology do its work, let us not have Congress ask any questions right now.

Well, that would be all well and good if those entities had the resources to carry out their job. But the Election Assistance Commission has been formed very late. In fact, a year late. Virtually every deadline that it was given for the issuance of voluntary guidelines to help our local election officials for reports to Congress and for assistance to State and local election authorities has been missed. Today, the commission had its first public meeting, despite the fact it has no permanent office, no equipment it can call its own, no staff beyond the four commissioners and its detailees, and not even enough money to pay for rent for its offices, nor money to pay for the publication tomorrow of State election plans in the Federal Register. It had to depend on the generosity of the General Services Administration for this step required by the Help America Vote Act. Election plans must be published, but the commission has no authority to require changes in them. Public comments will be directed to State election authorities who are free to certify themselves as having met the requirements of HAVA, which essentially at this point has no standards.

So in 45 days with their own certification and no input from the commission, they will begin to receive more than \$2.3 billion to spend with no security standards and no guidance beyond the limited verbiage in the act itself. If this were any other Federal program, how many of our colleagues would be here condemning it? Testing by the National Institute of Standards and Tech-

nology on voting machines and its obligation to help develop tough standards for this new equipment was suspended for 2 months this year because of the lack of Federal money.

The commission is thankful that NIST has been able to identify \$375,000 to help the technical guidance development committee get under way, but it is only getting under way. No recommendations are expected for another 9 months while the commissioners themselves recognize that State and local election authorities are looking for Federal guidelines to help them develop their own standards.

In fact, AP writer Robert Tanner said this weekend, and I will place the entire article in the RECORD, "High-tech voting machines can miscount election results through a software bug or a crashing computer. What is even more troubling, they can be manipulated if someone hacks the computer software. And the biggest problem is without a paper ballot, there is nothing tangible to recount."

To offer some level of guidance, the commission today voted to hold its own hearing on election voting technology within 35 days. I applaud the commission for doing so, but nothing is more important than our right to vote. We must take the time to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, I urge State and local election officials to read my remarks in the RECORD.

ELECTION FIX STYMIED BY DELAYS, COMPUTER DOUBTS, CONFIDENCE GAP

Editors Note—Problems with the election system in Florida left the winner of the 2000 presidential race in doubt for more than a month, and prompted widespread calls to reform the way the nation elects its leaders. Yet nearly four years since George W. Bush won in Florida by 537 votes, reform has been spotty. This story is part of the AP's ongoing coverage of electoral problems across the country.

(By Robert Tanner, AP National Writer)

The discord of Florida 2000 is hard to forget. Angry crowds yelling at local election officials, a paralysis that virtually halted other political work, accusations of a stolen presidential election that echo today.

But the many promises that followed the 36-day stalemate have not produced a nationwide solution to the glaring flaws exposed in the way we cast votes and count them—and another presidential election is just months away.

There's blame enough to go around. Pick any of the following, or all: President Bush and Congress; the voting machine industry; local election officials. (You can add computer scientists, the media, even mistake-prone voters.)

It's true some changes have been made: Roughly 50 million registered voters, or slightly more than a quarter nationwide, will be able to cast ballots on the latest touchscreen equipment this year.

But that leaves the glass half-full, at best, especially with the biggest reforms so far now coming in for criticism. In particular, those ATM-style electronic voting machines—once trumpeted as the solution to voting problems—are now under fire from some computer scientists and lawmakers. That, in turn, is slowing further reforms and weakening confidence in the system even more.

"You have resistance, sort of natural resistance, to change," said Ken Blackwell, Ohio's secretary of state. Legislators in his state, worried about security, want an end to electronic machine purchases, even if punch cards remain in many counties.

In critics' eyes, the problems have been worsened by electoral officials blind to the dangers of a broken system or influenced by political aims, and caring too little about damage done to voters' trust. Others see the slow progress as healthy—that's the way democracies work, they argue, by publicly hashing out problems.

Either way, the bottom line is that another razor-thin presidential election could again leave a victor unclear, a system unable to smoothly resolve the problem, and a skeptical and angry public.

The pitfalls break down into three broad categories: cash, computers and confidence.

After the 2000 crisis, promises of electoral reform didn't translate into quick action. It took nearly two years for Congress to pass the law giving states money and direction to buy new machines, and improve voter registration and training.

The problem was the policy-makers were pulled in different directions—minority and disabled voters sought federal standards to ensure all had equal access to the polls, while state election officials argued local control would best serve widely different communities.

Experts produced nearly a dozen studies, including recommendations from a Gerald Ford-Jimmy Carter commission (some of its top ideas, like making Election Day a holiday and giving all felons the right to vote after serving their sentence, were promptly ignored).

Money for the states to implement reform took even longer: Of \$3.8 billion promised, states have only received \$650 million so far.

The commission that was to be created to dole out money and advice was delayed by arguments between the White House and Congress. Members weren't appointed until December, less than a year before the 2004 election.

"I put the largest blame on Congress itself," said Kim Brace, an elections expert who consults with states. "They built up a lot of hope in the rhetoric side and fell through dramatically on the action side. And certainly on the dollars."

THE DELAYS CONTINUE

Critical technical work on voting machines, tasked to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, was suspended for two months this year because of a lack of federal money. The institute's job? Make sure standards are tough for computerized touchscreen voting machines.

And that leads to the heart of the fight: Critics, including some prominent Democrats, say the ATM-style machines are a bigger danger than punch cards. Source of the infamous "hanging chad" ballots that left Florida election commissioners trying to divine voter intent from bumps on the cards.

Lately, those warnings have been heard: Besides Ohio, officials are reconsidering or delaying the switch to new machines in California, West Virginia, Utah, and more.

"Why trade one imperfect system for another imperfect system?" David Wilde, a councilman in Salt Lake County, asked when questions were raised there about switching to touchscreen machines.

COMPUTER SCIENTISTS' WORRIES RUN MUCH DEEPER

The high-tech voting machines, they say, can miscount election results through a software bug or a crashing computer; what's even more troubling, they can be manipulated if someone hacks the computer's soft-

ware. And the biggest problem is that, without a paper ballot, there is nothing tangible to recount.

Because the voting machine industry keeps its computer code secret, claiming competitive business concerns, no one can be truly confident that the machines are as secure as they promise, critics say.

"If something can be stolen, eventually it will be," said Barbara Simons, a retired IBM computer scientist. "Our democracy is much too valuable to trust them to this machine. . . . If the election is close—or the opinion polls are close—that means people aren't going to trust the outcome. And there's no way to convince them that they are right."

The solution, in this view, are "voter verifiable paper trails"—a paper ballot that the computer prints after a vote is cast, that the voter can see to ensure their choice was accurately recorded, and that will be locked away for any recount.

A number of studies of the electronic machines have confirmed the doubts including a harshly critical one from Johns Hopkins University. Studies in Maryland and Ohio also found flaws, but said they could be corrected.

The divide is deep, however, with exasperated election officials and executives from the voting machine industry arguing that critics are inflating small problems into systemwide dangers and frightening voters unnecessarily.

"I think touchscreen is the best voting system," said Pam Iorio, the former elections supervisor in Florida's Hillsborough County (Tampa), where touchscreens were installed. "Election officials have just not been able to get their message out."

The paper trail proposed would "do more harm than good," said Dawn Williams, who oversees elections in Marshall County, Iowa. The receipts will just confuse voters, add more equipment to break down and more burdens for poll workers.

Primary elections so far this year have produced small glitches—machines that failed to boot up in San Diego, coding problems in Georgia and Maryland—but no outright disasters. Supporters of the new technology say that proves the wisdom of their confidence; doubters say it shows nothing of the sort.

The suspicion of critics is compounded by the fact that election officials and the voting machine industry are often closely intertwined.

Washington state's secretary of state went to work in the industry; so did several election officials in California. Under scrutiny is a job change in California, when the former state official in charge of evaluating voting machines took a top job with Election Systems and Software, a large manufacturer.

Those in the relatively small world of elections say that's natural.

"I personally don't see anything wrong with it," said Ernie Hawkins, who retired last year as head of Sacramento's election division. "You know the business, you know the problem, you know where the dangers are. I'd probably be more inclined to listen to someone who was trying to sell me something if they knew what they were talking about."

And don't leave out the politics. The chief executive of Ohio-based Diebold Inc., one of the largest voting machine manufacturers and a top target of security critics, is a top fund-raiser for the Bush campaign. In an August fund-raising letter, Walden O'Dell sought \$10,000 donations and declared he was "committed to helping Ohio deliver its electoral votes to the president next year."

He later announced that he would "try to be more sensitive" and would lower his political profile.

While errors are inevitable in a system recording tens of millions of votes nationally, it's clear that scrutiny of the voting system will be at an all-time high this year. A greater-than-usual number of election officials have quit or taken retirement. Others are just hoping for a presidential blowout.

"Every election official's prayer is, you hear many times, they really don't care who wins," said Richard Smolka, an elections expert and retired political science professor. "They just don't want the election to be that close."

TITLE III—UNIFORM AND NONDISCRIMINATORY ELECTION TECHNOLOGY AND ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

Subtitle A—Requirements

SEC. 301. VOTING SYSTEMS STANDARDS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Each voting system used in an election for Federal office shall meet the following requirements:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the voting system (including any lever voting system, optical scanning voting system, or direct recording electronic system) shall—

(i) permit the voter to verify (in a private and independent manner) the votes selected by the voter on the ballot before the ballot is cast and counted;

(ii) provide the voter with the opportunity (in a private and independent manner) to change the ballot or correct any error before the ballot is cast and counted (including the opportunity to correct the error through the issuance of a replacement ballot if the voter was otherwise unable to change the ballot or correct any error); and

(iii) if the voter selects votes for more than one candidate for a single office—

(I) notify the voter that the voter has selected more than one candidate for a single office on the ballot;

(II) notify the voter before the ballot is cast and counted of the effect of casting multiple votes for the office; and

(III) provide the voter with the opportunity to correct the ballot before the ballot is cast and counted.

(B) A State or jurisdiction that uses a paper ballot voting system, a punch card voting system, or a central count voting system (including mail-in absentee ballots and mail-in ballots), may meet the requirements of subparagraph (A)(iii) by—

(i) establishing a voter education program specific to that voting system that notifies each voter of the effect of casting multiple votes for an office; and

(ii) providing the voter with instructions on how to correct the ballot before it is cast and counted (including instructions on how to correct the error through the issuance of a replacement ballot if the voter was otherwise unable to change the ballot or correct any error).

(C) The voting system shall ensure that any notification required under this paragraph preserves the privacy of the voter and the confidentiality of the ballot.

(2) AUDIT CAPACITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The voting system shall produce a record with an audit capacity for such system.

(B) MANUAL AUDIT CAPACITY.—

(i) The voting system shall produce a permanent paper record with a manual audit capacity for such system.

(ii) The voting system shall provide the voter with an opportunity to change the ballot or correct any error before the permanent paper record is produced.

(iii) The paper record produced under subparagraph (A) shall be available as an official record for any recount conducted with respect to any election in which the system is used.

HOUSE TO DEBATE BUDGET
RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time. In the 2000 Presidential election, President Bush declared that he was against nation building. Who knew it was America he was talking about? President Kennedy used to say, to govern is to choose, and how we make our choices in this budget is a reflection of our values and the choices we want to make for the American people. It is not just a set of numbers; it is a set of priorities, a set of values, a set of principles.

I put together an analysis of what the President has done here in America with his budget and what he is doing in Iraq with the American taxpayers' money. Take job training, for instance. In the United States, although we have cut \$316 million in vocational education, in Iraq, \$60 million for demobilizing and job training for 130,000 enemy combatants. Funding is \$353 million for American enterprise fund and job training. \$151 million has been cut in adult training here in the United States. Those are values; those are priorities.

Take the area of college education. Here in the United States we have cut \$101 million in the President's budget for Perkins loans; \$327 million has been cut in Pell grants for college education. In Iraq, \$20 million for higher education and development projects creating U.S.-Iraqi university partnerships.

Expanding literacy, we have cut reading programs here in the United States; \$40 million for building 275 schools and training 10,000 teachers in Iraq. That is just one example of the set of priorities and values that the President's budget reflects here at home.

My view is, I am for investing in Iraq's future, giving the children of Iraq a future, but not one that is less promising and less strong and less valuable than the one we have here for the people in the United States. We should not invest in Iraq for things we are not willing to invest for here in the United States.

Take the issue of health care. Americans are facing a huge health care crisis. Costs are growing by 20 percent a year for the last 3 years and are expected to grow like that going forward. What have we done since the President got elected? We used to have 38 million uninsured in America, today we have 43 million uninsured, and not a single proposal to deal with it.

In the President's budget, we cut \$278 million for health professional train-

ing. In Iraq, we fund free training for 2,200 health professionals and 8,000 volunteers.

There has been a \$94 million cut to community access programs to coordinate health care services to underinsured. In Iraq, \$793 million has been spent for health care construction and medical equipment. \$78 million in the United States is cut for health activities to provide health care for rural America; \$28 million is provided for operation and staffing of 150 health clinics for 3 million Iraqis.

Down here, funding has been cut for all child care programs here in the United States; \$44 million is provided for community development projects in Iraq for child care facilities. Those are our values; those are our priorities. Why is Congress willing to fund Iraq's health care professionals, why are we investing American money for 2,200 new health care professionals, yet here in the President's budget we cut health professional training not just by \$78 million. That is a 64 percent cut in that budget.

What is it about the Iraqi health care system that we can see an investment that will reap the benefits of a stronger, healthier Iraqi population; but here at home, we say to rural America and community health care, we say to control cost, we are going to cut and slash. Those are our values; those are our priorities. These budgets are not numbers. They reflect what we care about and what we envision. We cannot have a vision for Iraq that is stronger and better than the one that we envision for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, that is just in the area of health care. In the Corps of Engineers, in Iraq we have opened up a new port for commerce. In the United States, the Corps of Engineers, we have a 10 percent cut in their budget, in the President's budget. We are investing \$4 billion to open up a new port in Iraq, and we are cutting the Corps of Engineers here in the United States that helps economic growth and the movement of goods and services.

That budget for Iraq reflects our values, and that budget for America reflects our values. These are not our values at work. We can have differences among our parties; but ultimately the budget has to reflect what we think and how we see America growing, how we see our children getting educated, how we see our workers getting trained, and how we see the health care for our communities.

We cannot invest in Iraq in a way that envisions they have a brighter future than the one we are envisioning for our own families. As we hear from my colleagues this evening about the budget choices we make, there are other areas we are going to be talking about on education, job training, health care, commerce, the environment.

We have a policy for the marshes to be restored in Iraq, yet we are cutting the Environmental Protection Agency

in the United States. We have a \$4 billion water program going on in Iraq, yet for our drinking water facility we have cut \$300 million here at home. Those are not our values; those are not our priorities.

So when the President declared in 2000 when he was running for the Presidency that he was against nation building, he was right; but who knew it was the United States he was talking about. But think of the upside: in 2004 when President Bush seeks reelection, he can at least say he kept his commitment, that he was against nation building because the end result of his economic policies, the end result of his budgets, 9 million uninsured Americas, 2.7 million Americans who had jobs since he became President lost their jobs, 43 million Americans have no health care, 33 million Americans work full time without health care, 2 million additional children who used to be part of the middle class are now in poverty, and a trillion dollars' worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on.

As Ronald Reagan once said, facts are a stubborn thing. Those are the facts, and those are the results of the President's economic priorities. This is his fourth budget since being President. He has made an investment in Iraq that he has not measured up and made here in the United States. We must have the priorities that we hold for Iraq to be true for the United States. That is what this debate and this discussion about the budget is.

Mr. Speaker, I thank again the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for allowing me this opportunity to lay out some of the choices that I went through on the budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) for his contribution.

The gentleman was talking about the budget. The reason the budget is topical is tomorrow the House takes up what we call the budget resolution. It is a tough task that lies before us tomorrow. The budget resolution is just an outline. This is it right here. I have the Democratic substitute to it. It is about 67 pages double-spaced. So why is it so tough? It is tough because the deficit this year is \$521 billion. This year, 1 year, the deficit is \$521 billion.

□ 2015

The budget is in deficit over the next 10 years by at least two to three times that amount, by at least \$4 trillion on top of that amount. That is one reason the task is tough.

It is also tough because we did not have to be here. We did not have to be in this situation. Three years ago when President Bush took office, he gained a benefit that no President in recent history has enjoyed. He gained a budget which he inherited in surplus, big-time surplus, by more than \$100 billion. The previous year, the year 2000, the surplus was \$236 billion. We actually paid off debt of the United States in 1999, 2000 and 2001. That was the context in which Mr. Bush came to office.

His economists at his budget shop, the Office of Management and Budget, looked out over the next 10 years and told the President they foresaw surpluses, cumulative surpluses, of \$5.6 trillion. Today, just 3 years later, those surpluses have disappeared. Vanished. They are gone. They are no more. In their place we have a deficit, a cumulative deficit, of \$2 to \$3 trillion over the next 10 years, depending on assumptions you make about tax and spending policy.

What happened to that surplus of \$5.6 trillion? As it turned out, we warned the President. We had seen surpluses like this projected before. The projection is really an economist's construct of the future, and they missed it. They misestimated the size of the surplus by at least 50 percent. And when you diminish the surplus expected of \$5.6 trillion by 50 to 55 percent, it becomes \$2.6 to \$2.8 trillion. All of that remaining surplus has now been wiped out by tax cuts and then some, and by spending increases, largely for defense.

The President says we have to rein in spending, but for the most part, spending has gone to defense, homeland security, the New York bailout, the airline bailout, the consequences of 9/11, categories that could hardly have been controlled. Domestic discretionary spending on education and health care and the environment has been growing at 2 to 3 percent a year. He says we have to rein it in, but he ignores the spending category that is the big spike in the budget.

In any event, the surplus has disappeared. The surplus of \$5.6 trillion is no more. It has been replaced by a deficit. So you would expect the President in that light to send us a budget this year that would begin to move us into balance, take us back to the path we were on when he came to office, when he saw nothing but surpluses for the next 10 years.

The President does indeed present us a budget which claims to cut the deficit in half by 2009, within 5 years. But he omits from that calculation anything for waging war of low intensity against the insurgencies and so forth in Iraq and Afghanistan. Nothing for the deployments we have there. Even though his Office of Management and Budget says that there will probably be at least \$500 billion more needed sometime later this year or early next year, you will not find that calculated anywhere in the President's budget.

When he says we are going to cut the deficit in half, not a nickel after 2004 is included for the cost of our deployments in Afghanistan and Iraq, even though the cost is substantial and they are not coming to an end, unfortunately, anytime soon.

And so the President does not bring the budget to balance. Indeed, he does not run his budget out 10 years as was customary just a few years ago.

When he came to office, so that he could say that there is plenty of support for the type of tax cut I am pro-

posing, \$1.7 trillion in tax reduction over 10 years, he extended his projection of the budget out over 10 years to get the cumulative total of \$5.6 trillion. Those who looked closely noticed that two-thirds to three-fourths of all that surplus occurred in the second half of that 10-year period of time. Now, the surplus has disappeared, the basis for those tax cuts has been removed, so what does the President recommend for next year? Another \$1.3 trillion in tax reduction. He recommends making permanent all of the tax cuts made in 2001, 2002 and 2003.

We are not here tonight to advocate higher taxes or more taxes or more revenues. We are here to advocate rebalancing the budget as a critical domestic priority, particularly given the fact that in just a few years we are going to see a demographic phenomenon the likes of which this country has not seen before, the retirement of the baby boomers. Within 20 years, the number of people on Social Security will nearly double. The number of beneficiaries on Medicare will nearly double. We should be preparing now by saving, and we are not.

We are dissaving. We are spending more than we take in. As a consequence, our children are going to have to bear the cost of Medicare and Social Security for our retirement, for the baby boomers' retirement. And in addition to that, they are going to have to bear the consequences of the debt that we are now stacking up, which could easily be \$7, \$8, \$9 trillion by the time the baby boomers begin to retire and start drawing their benefits. That is why this is a serious period that requires serious fiscal policy.

So what does the President recommend? He recommends another \$1.3 trillion in tax cuts, and the budget resolution that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, will bring up tomorrow will embrace essentially the same tax agenda, which can only mean, given the fact that we have no surplus anymore, that every dollar of those tax cuts, if they are enacted and implemented, every dollar of revenue lost due to those tax cuts will go straight to the bottom line, will enlarge the deficit and will make it bigger and not smaller.

That is the situation we find ourselves in tonight and tomorrow as we take up the budget resolution, with a tough problem and difficult to handle.

Before going further, let me recognize the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his hard work on the budget. It is a lot of hard work and a lot of dedication. He articulates what the problem is.

I like to use charts when I discuss the budget because sometimes people lose perspective of exactly what the problem is when you talk about the budget and the mess that we are in.

This is a chart showing the deficit from the Johnson administration,

Nixon, Ford, Carter. The red here is the Reagan and Bush deficits; the green is the Clinton administration digging us out of the mess; and the red is the present Bush administration budget.

The difference between the \$100 billion surplus that we expected and the over-\$650 billion deficit we see now, this is on-budget, this is after you have spent the \$150 billion Medicare and Social Security surplus, that is a \$750 billion swing. That is a big number.

I like to put it in perspective. If you look on the Federal budget, on the line item Revenue Individual Income Tax, that is all the individual income tax that we take in, we take in less than \$800 billion in individual income tax. Here in 3 years, the budget deterioration, the deficit situation has deteriorated \$750 billion, almost the entire value of the entire individual income tax that we take in.

As the gentleman from South Carolina indicated, we had a surplus. When this administration came in, the budget discussion, the questions that were asked of Chairman Greenspan, questions like, if we paid off the entire national debt, what would happen to the interest rates? What would happen to the bond market? Should we retire all of the debt or just the long-term debt or maybe just the short-term debt? That was the discussion, how to pay off the national debt.

Since the first budget of this administration was enacted, we have not heard anything about paying off the national debt.

Some of the Republicans want to take credit for some of the hard work and tough decisions made during the Clinton administration. I would remind them that when the Clinton administration came in and passed the first budget, it was passed by the narrowest of margins and not a single Republican in the House or in the Senate voted to start this green line going up.

In 1995, when the Republicans used those votes, demagogued those votes, took over the House and the Senate and offered their first budget, it included massive tax cuts. President Clinton vetoed those tax cuts. They threatened to close down the government if he did not sign the tax cuts. He vetoed them anyway. They shut down the government and he vetoed them again. He would not sign a budget that would wreck the progress that we had already made. As a result of the presidential vetoes, not the congressional action, the presidential vetoes, we maintained a straight line all the way up to a surplus of \$100 billion.

When President Bush came in, the Congress passed those tax cuts again, and we see what happened as a result.

The administration promises to cut the deficit in half within 5 years. First of all, as the gentleman from South Carolina indicated, the President is not going to be able to achieve that goal. But the goal itself is insulting. We started this administration with a surplus expected to be \$100 billion and now

we have gotten into the mess and the President only promises to clean up half of the mess. What we ought to be talking about is, when do we get back to a major surplus and when do we pay off this additional debt that we actually have?

We got into that mess with massive tax cuts. The administration and some Republicans like to say, who got the tax cuts? This chart by 20th percentiles shows the lowest 20 percent, the middle 20 percent, third 20 percent, fourth 20 percent, the highest 20 percent, highest upper-income brackets. Who got the tax cuts?

You can call it what you want. This is the chart. There is a line here at about the 50 percent mark. Half of the value of the tax cuts went to the upper 1 percent of the population. So whatever they say, this is the chart.

When you run up that kind of debt, you have to pay it back off, but in the meanwhile, you have to pay interest on the national debt. This chart shows the interest that we will be paying on the national debt.

This line is the interest we expected to pay as we were paying off the entire national debt; that is this dark line here. The red line is the interest on the national debt that we are going to have to pay because we have messed up the budget.

These lines show the difference in interest on the national debt. It is going to be \$341 billion more in interest on the national debt every year and growing. By 2010, about \$1.2 trillion in additional interest on the national debt.

\$341 billion additional interest on the national debt; like I said, we are bringing in less than \$800 billion in individual income tax, but \$341 billion at \$34,000 apiece, that is enough to hire 10 million Americans, give 10 million American jobs at \$34,000 apiece.

There are only 9 million listed as unemployed. Ten million could have been hired with just the difference in interest on the national debt. Ten million. We are struggling to hire 100,000 police officers and cannot do it. We would like to hire 100,000 additional teachers, maybe even 1 million teachers. Ten million additional people at \$34,000 apiece just in the lost interest on the debt.

We were told we got into that mess to create jobs. You need a chart to show the jobs. This is one chart. There are other charts that show the same picture, the number of jobs from everybody's administration back to Harry Truman.

Harry Truman created about 4 million jobs in his second administration. Eisenhower, about 1.9 million jobs the first term, lost about 200,000 in the next term, but it is a net plus, 1.7 million. Kennedy-Johnson, Johnson, Nixon, Ford. Everyone creating jobs. Clinton, over 10 million jobs the first term, another 10 million jobs the second term; until you get to this administration, lost almost 3 million jobs already.

□ 2030

When we look at this chart, we wonder what happened. This administration will point to 9-11 as the cause for the loss in jobs. In my view, because we had so much additional spending right after 9-11, about \$40 billion, properly done, we should have been gaining jobs after 9-11. But whatever the situation with 9-11, just remember that this chart includes the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the hostages in Iran, Grenada, Persian Gulf War, Somalia, Kosovo. Everyone has had military involvement including the Korean War and the Vietnam War, and everyone creates jobs during those crises except this administration. We have lost jobs.

Now, we need to look at the chart because some in this administration will say that the tax cuts are working. Look at the chart. The economy is doing well. We look at the chart. This is the worst since Harry Truman. Actually, the worst since the Great Depression, but this chart just goes back 50 years. This is not a good result. The tax cuts did not work. Millions of Americans lost their jobs.

The final chart shows the real crisis that we have, and that is maintaining Social Security. Chairman Greenspan said if we make the tax cuts permanent, we have to, I think he said, adjust Social Security. He did not say cut, but the people will get less than they anticipated. Most people would call that a cut. Increase the age of retirement, reduce the cost-of-living increases, most people would consider those as cuts; but we will use "adjust." If we make the tax cuts permanent, we must adjust Social Security. This chart shows that we are bringing in more Social Security than we are paying out now, and in 2017 we are going to start paying out more than we are bringing in.

This chart shows that in just a few years we will be paying out \$300 billion more in Social Security than we are bringing in. If we add the Social Security deficit with the additional interest on the national debt, the GAO just recently produced a chart that showed that the projected Federal revenues in just a couple of decades will be insufficient to pay the Social Security deficit and interest on the national debt. It will be insufficient to pay that. Before we get to Medicaid and Medicare and before we get to all other government spending, just the deficit and Social Security and interest on the national debt will absorb all Federal revenues.

There is one thing about this chart that is interesting, and that is as challenging as this chart is, if the President, instead of giving a tax cut to that upper 1 percent, had allocated what he has got in store for the upper 1 percent into the Social Security trust fund, we would have been able to pay Social Security without reducing benefits or adjusting benefits for 75 years. Or we can look out for the upper 1 percent and give them the tax cuts that the President has proposed. We had a choice. We

had a choice in education, tax cuts for the millionaires or Pell grants and fully fund No Child Left Behind.

We have talked about veterans benefits. We do not pay enough in the budget proposed by the Republican majority, not enough to maintain present services for veterans health care. Homeland Security, underfunded. The troops are not properly equipped. And this administration has shown no indication that they care about the budget. I mean, just the way that the war has been fought, we appropriated \$87 billion a couple of months ago. We had already spent \$79 billion. That is \$166 billion on the war with more coming. The meter is still ticking. \$166 billion is more than we spent in a year in the Department of Homeland Security plus the Department of Education plus the Department of Transportation plus the Department of Labor plus the Department of State, combined, not up to \$166 billion. What has this administration talked about as to how to pay for it? Tax cuts and no cuts in spending? It all goes to the bottom line.

Now, \$166 billion compared to the Persian Gulf War 12 years ago, how much did we spend on the Persian Gulf War? How much did the Persian Gulf War cost the United States of America? \$7.4 billion, 7.4. We have spent 166 billion already and counting. It cost 7.4 billion because we had allies. It was not "my way or the highway." We had allies, and they paid most of the expenses. This time it is all on our dime. We are spending \$166 billion and more. It goes right to the bottom line on the deficit chart.

So I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina, we can do better than this. We do not create a chart like this by accident. We do not create this green shaded area by accident. Tough choices were involved. And we can make those tough choices. We can fund our priorities, the ones that the gentleman from Illinois talked about: the health care, the transportation, the housing, all of those needs. We can address those. But we have to do it in a fiscally responsible way.

During this period of time when we were exercising fiscal responsibility, making the tough choices, we were creating millions of jobs. When we resorted to fiscal irresponsibility, none of the tough choices, we noticed that not only have we wrecked the budget, but we have also lost jobs in the process. So these are the kinds of things that are going on.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I would like to pick up where the gentleman left off with more explanatory charts. We have said that the projected surplus in the year 2001 when the President came to office was an unprecedented \$5.6 trillion. There it is on this simple table. Under the President's fiscal policies and under the situation of the times, not all of his making, that surplus declined from \$5.6 trillion to a deficit today in accordance with his 2005 budget, which will equal over this same period of time 2002, 2011, a cumulative \$2.928 trillion deficit. From \$5.6 trillion in surplus to \$2.9 trillion in deficit. The arithmetic is simple. That is a reversal of \$8.5 trillion over a 3-year period of time. We have never seen fiscal discipline come so unraveled, all of the effort in the 1990s to put the budget in balance for the first time in 30 years, to put it in surplus, to bequeath that surplus to President Bush only to have it absolutely wiped out over the next 3 years.

Here is a very simple graph that shows the path the deficit has taken since 1989 when the first President Bush was the President. As we can see, under the administration of the first President Bush, the deficit declined and grew worse, from \$153 billion to \$221 billion to the point where in the last year the first President Bush held office, we had a deficit of \$290 billion. In 1991, 1992, a deficit of \$290 billion. That was the situation that President Clinton found when he came to office in January of 1993.

If we look at the curve rising up, it shows us that every year of the Clinton administration, the bottom line of the budget got better and better and better. Every year the deficit was lower until 1998 when we had a surplus for the first time in 30 years and in the year 2000 we had a surplus, a phenomenal surplus, of \$236 billion. The next year President Bush came to office. Three solid years preceded him in surplus. His own economists told him to expect a surplus of \$5.6 trillion. They blew it. They overestimated it. We warned him to be wary, but nevertheless that was the situation in which he came to office. Here is what has happened since. The \$521 billion here at the bottom of this chart is the projected deficit for this year from the administration. That is not our estimate. We are not trying to put some sort of spin on it. The facts are bad enough and speak for themselves. The Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Bush's shop, said the deficit this year will be \$521 billion.

As we see the next chart, we pick up that \$521 billion over here on the vertical axis, right there, \$521 billion, the deficit in 2004; and then we make some politically realistic, and we think budgetarily realistic, adjustments to the path that CBO, our Congressional Budget Office, has plotted for the

President's budget because they make certain assumptions that are, frankly, not realistic. For example, they require by law to assume that when a tax cut expires, it dies, it sunsets, it does not come back. We know from practical experience that popular tax cuts are almost always renewed, and therefore they do not give a plus-up to the budget. If we make assumptions like that, politically realistic assumptions, then the President's budget will go from \$521 billion to 389 next year. It gets a bit of a bounce from this economy. It is helping. The economy is helping diminish the budget deficit, but it bottoms out at about that level and stays around 300 to \$400 billion for the next 10 years to the point where in 2014, the deficit is still over \$500 billion: 521 in 2004; 502 in 2014. That is our best estimate of where we are going under the President's budget per his projections adjusted for what we consider political reality.

By the way, the blue line up there, which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) was just rising to call my attention to remind the Members, that is the plot we were on, the path we were taking when President Bush came to office, and that is how far we have descended into debt. From all the way up here, \$250 billion in surplus down to deficits of \$521 billion.

It is obvious to anyone, everyone, that a budget deficit of this magnitude requires bold measures. Simple half measures simply will not cut it. We learned that in the 1980s and the 1990s. We need a long-term plan for deficit reduction. We need enforcement to back up our intentions, and we need to look at every segment of the budget, spending and revenues both.

If we look at this simple pie chart here, we will see that this wedge, domestic nonhomeland security, discretionary spending, that is, education, the FBI, the Justice Department, the National Parks Service, the government as we know it falls in this wedge right here. The entitlement programs take up two thirds of the budget. This other wedge, the red wedge, is for defense and international support, international aid, foreign aid, discretionary spending; and then this sliver down here is homeland defense. A small sliver today, but growing every year, \$46 billion this year, an account that did not even exist in the budget 3 years ago.

□ 2045

Well, what does the President propose? Essentially what he proposes is to rein in spending, his words, but he goes only to this segment of the budget, 15 percent of the budget, domestic, nonhomeland security, domestic discretionary spending. He goes to it and begins to clamp down on it and take one-half to one percentage points out of it, cuts that do not seem that draconian in truth.

But, in effect, the President takes about \$10 billion to \$15 billion below constant dollar levels out of the domes-

tic discretionary accounts, and by the fifth year of his budget forecast, that is all that is left. That is all that is left. The cut amounts to \$40 billion to \$50 billion. It begins to become serious, particularly in accounts like education and health care.

Now, we have taken seriously this budget forecast because it is, I think, a call to arms. If you add up all of the deficits shown on this politically realistic line, they come to about \$3.5 trillion over the next 10 years. If we are realistic, honest, frank, and face the facts, that is the future we are looking at. I do not think that is a sustainable course. I do not think that is a future we want to have or a situation we want to bequeath to our children.

So we have come up with a budget that will be offered tomorrow as a substitute to the budget offered by our Republican colleagues. Their budget never gets in deficit, partly because they only run the budget out 5 years, not 10 years as was customary in the recent past. They do not go the extra 5 years, because that would require them to confront an uncomfortable decision.

Their tax cuts will expire within that second 5 years. They intend to renew those tax cuts. But if they renew those tax cuts that were passed in 2002, 2003 and 2001, if they renew those tax cuts, the budget will never balance, at least not on any chart we have got or any forecast that is likely to be made. It will be in deficit for as far out as the eye can see.

We, however, have taken our budget and run it out 10 years, and we have made certain assumptions about tax cuts. We protect middle-income tax cuts. We call for the extension of the marriage penalty provisions. We call for extension of the child tax credit at \$1,000. We call for extension of the 10 percent bracket. So we protect middle-class tax cuts.

In addition, we protect the estate tax. We protect the reforms in the estate tax and call for a reduction in the estate tax by substantial increases in the unified estate and gift tax credits.

What do we do? This is most important. After doing these things, spending \$10 billion over 5 years, more than they commit to education, \$4 billion more to the environment, all down the line with critical priorities, veterans health care, \$2.5 billion more than the President provides for veterans health care because veterans deserve it, we promised it, and they are stacked up trying to get appointments at veterans hospitals today. We have taken care of critical priorities with a really discriminating eye as to what really matters.

In the process, we have also provided for a fiscal framework that will balance the budget within 8 years, by 2012, will accumulate less debt each year, less deficit each year, than the Republican bill that is the main bill on the floor tomorrow. Our substitute will accumulate less debt, smaller deficits, and will balance by the year 2012.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I notice some of the gentleman's numbers are slightly different than the numbers I was using. I think we need to explain that these numbers are with the unified budget. The ones I was using were what are called on-budget, which means that you save the \$150 billion in Social Security and Medicare surpluses. That \$521 billion assumes that you have spent through that already, before you start counting the deficit.

Mr. SPRATT. The gentleman makes an excellent point. If the \$521 billion were not reduced or diminished by the offset of the Social Security surplus, which is about \$160 billion, it would instead be \$681 billion, instead of \$521 billion. In truth, he was here when we voted to do it. We have taken Social Security off budget. We acknowledge that the moneys in that trust fund are being accumulated today to be spent in the very near future, and they should not be consolidated with and diminish other accounts. You should look at the budget bottom line without offsetting the Social Security surplus gains.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I would also ask the gentleman, who was here leading the charge during the time when we eliminated the deficit and went to surplus, if he could explain what PAYGO means.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, the word "PAYGO" will be used frequently in this debate. In 1990, as we were trying to get our hands around the deficit, we came up with some budget process changes that had enormous significance. They were scoffed at at the time, but they have worked remarkably well.

One was the pay-as-you-go rule, or PAYGO rule. What it provided was if anyone wants to cut taxes, he must either cut taxes in one place in the code and raise them elsewhere, or find an entitlement benefit and cut it by an amount commensurate with the tax cut so that it is deficit neutral, it does not enlarge the deficit.

By the same token, if one wants to enhance, enlarge, liberalize an entitlement, benefit, it either has to be paid for with a new revenue stream or you have to cut another entitlement somewhere in order to offset it and make it deficit neutral.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is that the one behind you? The red, green and yellow on the floor.

Mr. SPRATT. I will put your favorite chart up.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. When we had PAYGO with the fiscal discipline, wherein if you increased the spending, you had to pay for it, or if you cut a tax, you had to pay for that, what color is that on the chart?

Mr. SPRATT. The green is surplus. It is deficit diminution. The red is a growing deficit.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Then what happened to PAYGO in recent years?

Mr. SPRATT. The PAYGO rule was adopted for 5 years, renewed again for 5 years in 1997, and expired in 2002, and has not been renewed. But for the PAYGO rule, the tax cuts that were passed in the early 2000 period by the Bush administration could not have come to the House floor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Unless they were paid for.

Mr. SPRATT. Offset, fully offset.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership in this extraordinary quest to balance the budget and provide the surpluses that this Nation so sorely needs. I would like to thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak tonight on an issue that I care greatly about.

I voted for the first Bush tax cuts, and I voted consistently to cut estate taxes and to eliminate the marriage penalty tax, so I do not think anybody could accuse me of being a wild-eyed tax and spend liberal, but I do understand fiscal responsibility and I understand what is important to the people I represent.

Our President speaks of his commitment to education and his dedication to our seniors and veterans and his support for improving health care, but when it comes to providing the funding needed to match this rhetoric, I am afraid this President refuses to put his money where his mouth is. In fact, our President cuts nearly all domestic programs after the year 2005. He cuts education and training programs, health care and environmental protection programs, and veterans programs as well, all of which are vitally important to the millions of Americans all across our vast country.

One item in this year's budget that escaped without any cuts is the Yucca Mountain project. Despite hundreds of unanswered scientific questions, multiple lawsuits now pending in Federal court and troubling homeland security issues, the President has budgeted nearly \$900 million for this white elephant, an increase of more than 50 percent.

Since September 11, we are living in a far more dangerous world, yet the administration refuses to acknowledge the very real terrorist threat that will be unleashed if thousands of shipments of nuclear waste are allowed to cross the Nation on their way to the State of Nevada. One terrorist attack on a shipment of high level nuclear waste could unleash the most deadly substance known to man, threatening lives and causing billions of dollars in environmental damage. The funding that is now being wasted on this giant hole in the middle of the Nevada desert should be used in ways that benefit America's families, not in the profits of the nuclear energy industry.

Why not pour these hundreds of millions of dollars into providing educational programs for our students,

greater access to health care, benefits for our veterans and into efforts to make our Nation energy independent? Or to restore the \$850 million in funding for homeland security activities that has been left out of the Republican budget?

In times of war, America has made promises to our veterans that we failed to fulfill in times of peace. As our troops fight in Iraq and Afghanistan and in countries across the globe, President Bush is refusing to ensure quality health care and pensions and benefits for our veterans. The Republicans provided \$1.3 billion less in funding than recommended by our VA Secretary for Health Care Programs, including cuts to long-term care that will affect over 8,000 former service members.

In Las Vegas, aging veterans need more care than their families can possibly provide, and they turn to the VA long-term care facilities to provide the necessary health care services. These brave men and women, who fought for and protected our Nation, must know that they can count on the VA to assist them with the care they have earned through their military service.

Our veterans deserve better than having to worry that the budget cuts at the VA will deny them the high-quality health care they were promised when they left military duty. We must send them a message that we are indebted to their sacrifices and that we remain committed to our promises and to increasing these levels of funding to keep pace with the demand in Las Vegas and nationwide.

Another area, Madam Speaker, of the budget that is of vital importance to my district is funding for dropout prevention programs. Nevada has one of the highest dropout rates in this Nation. School officials in Nevada are working diligently to develop and implement programs to keep our kids in school, but they lack the funding and the resources at the local level.

I do not have to tell the gentleman that students that do not earn a diploma, that do not graduate from high school, will make far less in the workplace than their counterparts, and they are at a high risk of incarceration, far higher than those who do graduate high school. Sadly, the President's budget for fiscal year 2005 completely eliminates all Federal funding for dropout prevention efforts in Nevada and nationwide.

Like many other States, Nevada is facing a health care crisis. The exploding growth of Nevada has put a strain on our health care system. Working families in my State are struggling to make ends meet, and many are scared to death of the financial burden they face as a result of having no health insurance should they require medical treatment.

The Bush budget does nothing, nothing, to help these families access health care or obtain insurance coverage. Instead, it hands almost \$46 million over to the HMOs, cuts training

for nurses by 60 percent and slashes Medicaid.

Not only does the Bush budget ignore the realities of the uninsured, the President has also proposed shifting the cost of Medicaid onto the States. Most of our States are already facing a fiscal crisis. In the State of Nevada, we raised taxes to an unprecedented level. In Nevada, this shift that the President is suggesting will result in those most in need of assistance, children, the disabled and working families being cut from the rolls or having their benefits slashed unmercifully.

The President's budget represents far more than just numbers on a page. It is a commitment to meeting the needs of our Nation, our communities and those that we elected to serve in this United States Congress. The Bush budget fails to meet the needs of our veterans, our students, our teachers and our seniors.

Rather than invest in dropout prevention, long-term care for our veterans or protecting the Medicare system, this budget increases funding for Yucca Mountain at the expense of those who will suffer as a result of these misplaced priorities.

I would urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative. It makes sense, it is balanced, it is smart and it puts our Nation's citizens at the forefront when it comes to priorities.

I thank the gentleman for letting me share the problems that the people in my community are experiencing and that will only be exacerbated by the President's budget.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for her contribution.

Madam Speaker, going back to this chart, I think it should be obvious to almost any citizen, every fair-minded person, that a budget accumulating a deficit of \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion over the next 10 years, and possibly more, plotted by this line right here, is a budget that is not sustainable and should not be passed.

□ 2100

The Republicans have brought to the floor and will bring up tomorrow a budget resolution that, in effect, hides the outyear consequences because they simply quit in 2009. They do not go further. They do not extrapolate what will happen when the tax cuts, passed in 2001, 2002 and 2003, are made permanent. But what will happen is shown on this chart: the deficit will never get better. We have decided that this kind of problem requires bold decisions, and this budget resolution brought to the floor tomorrow by the majority party does not make them.

We are offering instead an alternative. It could be bolder, but it is definitely a step forward and a step in the right direction. Our budget fiscally will sustain smaller deficits each year and every year from 2005 through 2014 because we do not fear the extension of our budget into the outyears, because we propose a path through those years that will eventually bring us to bal-

ance. Indeed, our budget will balance in 8 years, by the year 2012, using realistic and reasonable assumptions. We will accumulate less debt, we will have smaller deficits, and we will put the budget back in balance.

Madam Speaker, let me emphasize too that in doing so, we will provide the same basic level for national defense as our Republican colleagues, and we will up them one. We will provide \$5 billion more than they provide for homeland defense. We will protect the middle-income tax cuts, as I said earlier, the marriage penalty, the 10 percent bracket, the child tax credit. We will even provide that the estate tax should be substantially reformed by significantly increasing the estate and gift tax credits.

Within that same context, we will provide \$10 billion more than our Republican colleagues do over 5 years, \$10 billion more for education. We will provide \$2.2 billion more for the environment. We will provide \$5 billion, as I said, more for homeland security. And over 10 years, we will provide \$6.6 billion more for veterans health care.

We have been discriminating and careful about the increases we have made. We have picked our priorities with care. But we protected those things that are essentially important, the safety net and important programs like veterans health care, as they should be protected; but we have still protected our children and our future by bringing the budget to balance within 8 years.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make this presentation and will be back to the floor tomorrow to pick up where we leave off tonight.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today being very disturbed with the direction that the Republican Party and this administration is taking our great Nation. The prime reason for my concern is the national budget which will come before this body tomorrow. The Nussle budget clearly does not improve upon the severely flawed Bush Administration budget. The needs of average Americans are still ignored. The interests of a wealthy few outweigh the needs of an entire Nation in this budget. I say this not out of partisanship, but from a statement of the facts. I want to highlight a few areas in this budget that are particularly egregious.

EDUCATION

This President and the majority party in this body have spent so much time talking about their record on education, and as hard as I try I cannot see what they have to be proud of. It is one thing to address areas of critical need with rhetoric, but to advocate a policy and then not fund it sufficiently is plain irresponsible. At the top of the list of my concerns is the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the fact that it has become an unfunded mandate. The House Republican resolution provides at least \$8.8 billion less than the \$34.3 billion authorized for education programs under the "No Child Left Behind" Act for 2005. This low funding leaves millions of elementary and secondary school students without the services Congress and the President promised just two years ago. For example, the Republican bud-

et denies Title I services to 2.4 million students who qualify under the Act.

But the irresponsibility does not end with No Child Left Behind. For the third straight year the Republican Party has frozen the funding level for Pell Grants. Both the Republicans and the President freeze the maximum Pell Grant award at the 2003 level of \$4,050, with an average grant of \$2,399. Such small Pell Grants make college unaffordable for millions of students: the College Board reports that tuition and fees at 4-year public colleges today average \$4,694. In any market this gap would be hard to swallow, but with the current state of joblessness that the Republican Party's agenda has created it is near impossible for so many American families to send their children to college. I fear that this agenda, if allowed to continue, will cause a perpetual state where our American families aren't able to succeed.

VETERANS

Our brave American veterans are another group who were outraged by the President's budget and will unfortunately be disappointed with the Republican House Budget. I hear so much in this body from the majority party about the greatness of our Armed Forces, and they're right, but again it's just empty rhetoric on their part. Those brave men and women fighting on the front lines in our War Against Terror will come back and find that the Republican Party looks at them differently once they become veterans. Almost all veterans need some form of health care, some will need drastic care for the rest of their lives because of the sacrifice they made in war, but the Republican Party continues to turn a blind eye to their needs. On a bipartisan basis, the Committee on Veterans Affairs recommended that \$2.5 billion more than the President's budget was needed to maintain vital health care programs for veterans. Nevertheless, the House Republican budget provides \$1.3 billion less than what the Committee recommended for 2005.

The entire Department of Veterans Affairs is going to suffer because of the Republican agenda. Over the next five years the money allocated to the Department of Veterans Affairs will not even be able to maintain these programs at their current levels. In 2007, the budget is \$227 million less than what the Department of Veterans Affairs needs to keep pace with inflation. Over five years, the Republican budget cuts \$1.6 billion from the total needed to maintain services at the 2004 level. I've heard from veterans groups throughout my district in Houston, and I'm sure each Member of this body has heard from groups in their own district, because veterans are one group that comes from all parts of this Nation. These brave veterans have told me their stories of how they are suffering now with the current state of Veterans Affairs. I am going to have trouble telling them that not only will things continue to stay bad, but if this budget passes this body things will only continue to get worse. That is not what our returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan should have to look forward to—a future where their needs are not only not provided for, but are in fact ignored.

IRRESPONSIBLE REPUBLICAN POLICIES

Education and Veterans Affairs make up only two areas where the Republican budget fails Americans. The truth is there are many other programs and services vital to our Nation that are at risk because of the Republican

agenda. At this point, an average American may be asking why the Republican Party finds it necessary to cut so many fundamental programs. The answer is simple, yet disturbing: The majority party is cutting important programs in order to finance all their irresponsible tax cuts. They will continue to make the argument that tax cuts provide stimulus for our economy, but millions of unemployed Americans will tell you otherwise. In fact the Congressional Budget Office itself said "tax legislation will probably have a net negative effect on saving, investment, and capital accumulation over the next 10 years."

While the Republican Party continues its offensive for irresponsible tax policies, they allow our national deficit to grow increasingly larger. The deficits are so large and their policies are so irresponsible that they won't even make deficit projections past 2009. It's clear that the Republican Party is hiding from the American people. This President and this majority in Congress have yet to advocate a fiscal policy that helps average Americans. Special interests have become king in this budget at the price of sound fiscal policies.

DEMOCRATIC AND CBC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

The truth about the budget is that a sound fiscal policy that funds needed programs is possible. The Democratic Alternative Budget and the CBC Alternative Budget are both examples of how we can get out of the quagmire that the Republican agenda has put this Nation in.

The Democratic budget achieves balance within eight years through realistic policy choices that protect funding for key services. The Democratic budget also has a better bottom line than the Republican budget every year, meaning a smaller national debt and fewer resources wasted paying interest on the national debt. Chronic deficits crowd out private borrowing, run up interest rates, and slow down economic growth. In addition, the Democratic budget provides \$1.3 billion more than the Republican budget for veterans programs for 2005 and \$6.6 billion more over five years. The Democratic budget provides \$2.1 billion more for appropriated education and training programs than the Republican budget for 2005 and \$9.8 billion more over the next five years. The Democratic budget also provides \$3.7 billion in mandatory funding to make up the current shortfall in funding for Pell grants and additional funding to make college loans cheaper for students. These programs are all funded while maintaining a sound fiscal policy. The Democratic budget achieves balance within eight years through realistic policy choices that protect funding for key services. The Democratic budget also has a better bottom line than the Republican budget every year, meaning a smaller national debt and fewer resources wasted paying interest on the national debt. Republicans will surely try to counter this by touting the benefits of tax cuts. However, most Americans are waking up to the fact that mass tax cuts targeted toward the wealthiest Americans will only bog down our national economy. The Democratic budget accommodates the extension of marriage-penalty relief, the child tax credit, and the ten percent individual income tax bracket. These tax cuts provide relief to middle-class families whose incomes have stagnated under the current administration's economic policies. This is what a sound fiscal policy really stands for.

This body was made to stand for the will of all Americans; if we allow this budget proposal to take effect we will have failed our mandate. I for one will not stand by silently; I have a duty to my constituents and indeed to all Americans to work for their well being and I will continue to honor that duty.

INNOVATIVE BUDGETING PROCEDURES FOR CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.) Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I believe the Federal Government must return to a balanced budget, not just as a goal of sound financial policy, but also as the sacred moral fulfillment of commitments that we have made to the American people.

I am pleased to be joined here by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who has joined across the ideological spectrum of our party to make sure that we have a budget that not only cuts the deficit, but that is enforced to make sure that the commitments we make under that budget are actually fulfilled.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for his work on this budget issue as well. Only if all of us work together to bring real reform to the budget process can we actually achieve that. The prior speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), is a person who also deserves a tremendous amount of credit for his work on the budget issue. He is a person who has been around and has witnessed this budget process work and not work, and we really do look forward to working with him on this issue as well.

Madam Speaker, I want to briefly describe what the problem we have here is. Every time we bring a budget to the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate and pass something, and we pass a budget every year, we debate about the numbers, we debate about the glidepath, the dates, all of those things. We just saw the charts of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

This week the House Committee on the Budget will be bringing a budget resolution to the floor. The problem with this entire process is, once Congress sets a budget, Congress does not have to stick to that budget. That is a big problem. Look at how we do it with our family budgets. We do not have the ability to just assume more income into our families when we set a budget for our family budget for the year. However, Congress does that. So what we have here in this current system, it marks the 30th year where we have operated under these current rules, since

the 1974 Budget Act was passed, where we will pass a budget resolution, not into law, but as a resolution, binding Congress for the year to those numbers. The problem is, Congress does not have to follow those resolutions, and there are a thousand tricks out of those budget caps.

What we have proposed together, many of us, a large group of us on the Republican side of the aisle, and now we have some Democratic cosponsors on some of our bills, so that we are making this a bipartisan effort is, number one, let us make our budget binding. Let us actually pass a budget at the beginning of the session and get its top numbers signed into law by the President so that we have a budget that is legally binding on Congress. Once that is established, that can, therefore, give us the rules to enforce that budget. If we pass a budget that is not legally binding that we do not have to adhere to, it is difficult to enforce it.

So what we are proposing is, and this is something our coalition has come up with, I have introduced legislation along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) to do this as well; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has also introduced legislation. What we are proposing is, number one, a budget that gets signed into law in its numbers by the President; and, number two, because it is a legally binding budget and a legally binding document, we can, therefore, enforce it. If Congress, if spending exceeds the budget in any given year, automatically, an across-the-board spending cut, a sequester, kicks in to bring us back into conformity with the budget if Congress does not pass a bill to bring us into conformity with the budget. If we want to break that spending, it is no longer a majority vote, which is the case today; it is a two-thirds vote in the House and the Senate to actually break this legally-binding budget.

There are many other things we do in this bill, but I think it is very important that as Congress sets its track for spending, as we decide our priorities, as we determine when we hope to balance the budget, what level of spending for this, what level of taxing for that, we ought to be able to enforce that budget so we have the discipline needed to adhere to those goals and those challenges and those numbers.

Now, there are some other things that we think we need to do to address this issue, and that is there are a thousand little tricks that are employed here in Congress to get around what little spending discipline we have. For instance, we can pass an emergency spending bill, although emergencies do not have to be paid for in the current budget rules. Emergencies are things like a natural disaster like a tornado or a hurricane or a flood or, God forbid, another act of terrorism. Those things

do not have to be paid for under our current budget rules.

The problem is, Congress can declare anything an emergency. A couple of years ago in this House, we passed an emergency bill that put a \$2 million summit house on top of Pike's Peak during, I think, it was a flood disaster emergency bill at that time. We can declare anything an emergency today, and that is one of the often-used tricks to get around the budget rules. We need to stop that, and one of the things we have proposed in our coalition that the gentleman from Illinois (Congressman KIRK) and I are members of and the legislation we are proposing is to tightly define what an emergency is, really what an emergency is.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, before we go into some of the other reforms we have talked about, people have asked, if the Republican leadership is in control of Congress, why can it not enforce its own rules? What we have seen time and time again is the leadership many times is defeated by a majority on the House floor. This is a lot easier if we make a supermajority requirement to enforce the decisions that we have already made.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, that is exactly right. We have a tight majority, and it is very easy for the leadership to come up with a good budget and good enforcement around that budget; but all it takes is a majority vote on the floor of the House to defeat that, and that often happens, that is often the case. Having that higher vote threshold makes it much more difficult for Congress to defeat its own budgets. Having a legally-binding budget, which automatically kicks in spending cuts across the board, forces Congress to act. And if Congress chooses not to act, then the across-the-board spending cut comes in. If two-thirds of the Members of Congress do not want that to happen, then they can make sure that that does not happen. But that is a much higher threshold.

Among the other tricks that we seek to limit here is not only do we want to tightly define what an emergency is, but we want to raise the vote threshold on emergencies to a two-thirds vote, so that that too is a protected procedure, not another game that can be used to get around the budget spending caps that we have. But also, we want to set aside money for emergencies. We often have emergencies in this country that need quick attention by Congress. That is why we are proposing to set up a rainy day fund. Several State legislatures and State governments do the same thing. Congress also should set money aside to budget for the inevitable emergencies that occur every single year. Clearly, we are not going to be able to plan for every emergency. We spent \$40 billion, as we needed to, after 9-11 to address that emergency. That was a lot of money; clearly, more than we have for our average tornado or natural disaster. But we can still try

and budget for the inevitable emergencies we will incur here this year.

Another thing that really happens that is a big problem in part of our appropriation process is in addition to the fact that the appropriations bills can form huge bills where they put seven to 10 appropriations bills in one giant omnibus bill, they can tack in spending items that have nothing to do with the issue at hand. Let us take, for example, one spending item that we voted against just this last December, \$50 million for a rain forest museum in Iowa City. They were going to build a rain forest under a glass bubble for \$50 million. That was tucked inside of an omnibus appropriations bill in the part that went to Labor and Health and Human Services. A \$50 million rain forest museum in the middle of Iowa has nothing to do with health, human services, or labor, the Labor Department. However, it was stuck into that portion of the bill.

Now, if we had the ability which, in this case, we did not in the House, to go to the floor, pass an amendment to defeat that \$50 million from going to that rain forest project, we could do that. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and I could bring an amendment to the floor saying, we should not be putting \$50 million into a boondoggle rain forest museum in Iowa; let us pass an amendment to defeat that. We could pass that amendment. But by the rules of this institution, by the laws of the 1974 Budget Act, that \$50 million would have to be respent somewhere else in the Federal Government. It could not be saved. So that is another thing we want to fix.

Another huge, glaring glitch in the budget process is we want to be able to come to the floor of Congress, identify wasteful spending, make sure that this kind of pork does not happen again and not only defeat the pork, not only get these projects not funded, but save the money so we can use it to reduce taxes or to reduce deficits or reduce debt. That is another reform we put inside of our bill and inside the coalition of principles that we have all agreed to subscribe ourselves too.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, the example of the rain forest is a powerful one that we focused on. But we have another reform that we have seen difficulties with: a line-item veto, which allows the President to identify pork barrel spending and eliminate it. But we have a fix.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We do. That is a very important point that the gentleman from Illinois raises. If my colleague recalls, the line-item veto was knocked down by the Supreme Court a few years ago, for good reason, which was it is unconstitutional, it was unconstitutional for Congress to delegate its lawmaking power to the executive branch; and the Supreme Court aptly knocked down that line-item veto law.

So what we have come up with in place of it is the ability for the executive, the President of the United

States, when he receives these big spending bills, to pull out pieces of spending, pork barrel spending and through an expedited procedure send those pieces of spending, those pork barrel projects back to Congress for an up-or-down vote on each of these procedures, each of these pork barrel projects. We have a procedure here where the President can make sure that he gets that vote. We cannot stonewall, we cannot filibuster it; we have to have a vote on this wasteful spending that the President can take out of these bills and send back to the Congress so we have another up-or-down vote to make sure that we have another chance, a redundant system to go after this wasteful spending. It accomplishes the same thing that a line-item veto does, but it retains the constitutional authority of the lawmaking body and the legislative branch that the Constitution and the Supreme Court calls for.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, this is the same way that we now close military bases, which was so difficult before.

We also talked about how, in the budget presentation to us, that the executive branch, the budgeteers, automatically include an inflation adjustment, so that we do not actually see clearly some of the increases that are in the budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is correct. And that is why some of the other forms that we are calling for, which is automatically, they just assume that we are going to keep raising spending. One of the things we see around here is a lot of Members of Congress come to the floor and say we are cutting spending on programs, when actually what is occurring, if at all, is reducing the rate of growth of programs. What we believe is we should go back to zero-based budgeting, and we can go back to not baseline budgeting, but a zero-based budgeting whereby a dollar extra for a program the next year is an increase in spending. We do not want to have a baseline that constantly inflates and puts spending on auto pilot for all parts of our government. We want to make sure that we are more frugal with our constituents' dollars and that an extra dollar in an extra year is an extra dollar of spending, not a reduction in spending.

□ 2115

Mr. KIRK. We have that to make sure that we show that what you got last year is higher than what you have got the previous year. This year is higher than what you got last year.

But we have a number of other problems in presenting the financial condition of the budgets. And that is that, as yet, we do not have a good picture of the full debts and liabilities of the Federal Government.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. One of the other things that we do not account for here in the accrual accounting is the costs of the pension that the Federal

Government owes to its employees and many of the other Federal Government's liabilities. If the accountants of the Federal Government had to subscribe to the laws that we have placed upon the private sector, we would make the accountants at Enron look like saints. We would not be able to adhere to the common private sector accounting principles that are employed in the marketplace today.

What we wanted to accomplish is a full, clear accounting for all of the Federal Government's debts and liabilities. And that is another thing because if you take a look at the way the Federal budget is displayed and presented to Congress, it does not fully reflect all of the Federal Government's debts and liabilities. That is misleading. We need a clear and accurate picture of truly what taxpayers are on the hook for, not a rosy scenario, not a disguised scenario, not one that makes the situation look better than it actually is.

Mr. KIRK. We have that.

We also are talking about changing the rules of Congress. There are some rules of the Congress that are never waived. Any Member can raise a point of personal privilege, and that has never been touched. But there are other rules of the Congress that are routinely waived. We make changes to affect the budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is right. One of the problems we have in this particular body, in the House Chamber, unlike the other body, is all the budget points of order that seek to protect our budget, to enforce our budget, are easily waived before they even get to the floor.

We have a Committee on Rules that sets the parameters of debate, the rules for the kinds of amendments that will be considered here. And the Committee on Rules, they can waive budget points of order. Therefore, if the Budget Enforcement Act of 1974 has a number in it that we miss and hit, and we break our budget, we are supposed to be able to have a point of order that defeats legislation coming to the floor that breaks our budget.

All it takes is a Committee on Rules to waive that point of order before it even gets to the floor and we pass a rule with a majority vote without even having to vote on whether or not we are going to break that point of order.

So the rules are so easily circumvented here on the floor that what we are doing is, we are making sure that these points of order are still maintained as points that Members individually can bring up. They cannot be waived in the Committee on Rules. They take a two-thirds vote. This is our preference in our particular legislation in order to waive these budget points of order.

Members of Congress need to be empowered with the rules so that they can raise the awareness that we are breaking our budget and they can force a vote to make sure we conform with the

budget, and it takes two-thirds to break that.

Mr. KIRK. Now, we are talking about a basic principle that should be obvious to everyone. The rules should be the rules. But we have embodied these ideas in a number of pieces of legislation.

I wonder if the gentleman could talk about his bill that has come out.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes, I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions about his bill as well.

I thank the gentleman for the mike. He has given me a lot of time to talk about ours.

Our bill is what we call The Family Budget Protection Act. Number one, our bill does change the rules of the House so that you cannot waive these budget points of order, meaning you cannot just break the spending caps and not even have a vote on whether we did that or not on the floor of Congress.

First, we make a binding budget so it is signed into law by the President.

Second, if Congress is going to break the budget, it takes a two-thirds vote in order to break that budget. If we do not vote that two-thirds, then we have an obligation to reduce spending to bring it back into conformity with the budget. If we do not do that, an across-the-board spending cut comes into play.

But also the games that are played in the appropriations process, putting nongermane spending items in the bills where they should not be, we tighten up what we call the germaneness standards so we cannot put those kinds of things in appropriations bills.

It is important that we are honest with the American people in how we spend their money. It is important that we make sure we set a budget and stick to it. And it is also important that we have a budget process that is at least neutral toward higher taxes and higher spending.

The 30-year anniversary of the 1974 Budget Act paints one very clear picture, and that is the rules that run the budgeting in Congress are clearly biased toward higher taxing and higher spending. And they tie both hands behind your back if your goal is to bring sense to the budget system, bring fiscal discipline and hold the line on taxes.

What we are seeking to achieve in our legislation is simply to make the rules at least neutral toward taxing and spending, not biased for higher taxing and spending. And that is something that we all have to work together on.

What I am very encouraged about year, and this is my sixth year in Congress; I have been working on this ever since I got here. What I am especially encouraged about is the new coalition that we have been able to form.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has been a leader in this new coalition to fix this budget process, and only by linking arms and building a team can we get these kinds of things

passed. So I would like for the gentleman to tell me some of his ideas about what he hopes to achieve in this budget process, which are all part of the broader principles that we signed on to and how exactly does the gentleman's bill work.

Mr. KIRK. I want to applaud the gentleman for his bill, which is now approaching 80 cosponsors. The companion legislation that I have introduced has 17. So we are now on our way to almost half of Republican Conference supporting comprehensive budget reform.

These reforms have been agreed to by dozens of Members on our side of the aisle and some Democrats because it is essential that this be a bipartisan reform effort to make sure that the rules really are the rules, to remove the spending bias in the Federal Government, so that we can get ahold of the spending picture and present it clearly to the American people; and to also make sure that we can root out some traditional, ages-long pork barrel spending included by the Congress, which a few powerful Members can support, but the body as a whole would never support, for example, a rain forest in Iowa City.

For us, it is important that we not only put forward these reform principles, but we put them in a broad principle, across party lines, and make sure that in the coming days we have not only passed a budget, but we pass legislation which allows easy enforcement of the budget. The budget should not be difficult to enforce. It should be very easy to enforce by a group of dedicated Members, fiscal conservatives who are watching the long-term bottom line of the U.S. Government.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is right. I applaud that.

One of the things that we have to keep in mind is that the demographics of America are changing. And as the baby boomers begin to retire, we have to take into account the fact that we have 40 million retirees today; when the boomers are fully retired, we will have 80 million retirees. And so many of our programs are geared towards senior citizens, namely, Social Security and Medicare, Medicaid as well. So we have a tremendous fiscal pressure staring us in the face.

In order to prepare for those moments, not only do we need to reform these programs so we can improve them and make sure they are solvent, but we have to be able to pass a budget that we can stick to and enforce to get us to that solvency date, to make these programs viable for the baby boomers and for our generation, the generation afterwards.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman for participating in this.

First, I think this is critical that we not only vote on a good budget this week, but that we bring up our legislation for budget reform in the coming weeks.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is right. I also think it is very important

to recognize that a lot of Members have worked on this issue. It is one thing to pass a budget under the current rules and talk about the great accomplishments we have in it; they are good accomplishments.

We are bringing a good budget resolution to the floor tomorrow, freezing domestic spending, getting to a balanced budget even faster than the President proposed, and he gave us a lean budget, making sure that we are not going to have huge tax increases hitting the American family just as the economic recovery is under way.

But the point of all this is, the current budget system, it is so easy to circumvent these budget rules, to circumvent the budget. So even though we are bringing what we think is a pretty good budget to the floor, actually a very good budget to the floor this week, we can easily circumvent it next month.

That is why we need to have a budget process that is honest, that has integrity, that is clear, that is transparent, that is honest with the American people, that has honest accounting, that makes sure that you cannot have these bills that we get a day before we vote on them, that are this thick, and have so many little programs tucked into them that are pork barrel projects that raise the total of spending for the Federal Government, but waste a lot of money and also have nothing to do with the issue at hand that we are trying to legislate on.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman very much.

This government, our government, has the prime duty given by the Founding Fathers to provide for our common defense. If we fail in that duty, we fail all other duties inherited by a free people. And I think that is the essential point that I want to make here. This is about honoring the promises that we have already made.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. One of the things, and I notice that there are some gentlemen coming in that I want to recognize when they all get in the room, that are in the gallery, that I think is very fitting for the House to recognize, but before I get to that, because I see some of them are still coming in, I think it is very important for them to recognize, and for those who are listening to this debate, we do not have the tools that we need to cut wasteful spending in Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). The Chair would remind the gentleman that references are not to be made to visitors in the gallery.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I apologize, Madam Chair. I simply wanted to recognize the fact that we have a group of Special Operations Forces in the gallery that just came back from Iraq. And I simply want to say to those, and I realize we have rules, that we are very proud of what you have done for our country, and we want to salute you

for your sacrifice to our Nation and to thank you for making us a safer and more secure world and country. Thank you for what you have done for us.

Will I be admonished for that?

Thank you, Madam Chair, for your indulgence.

I simply want to conclude by saying, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in this because he has been one of the linchpin people in Congress to bring together this coalition. You cannot have a handful of fiscal conservatives to try to change rules that have not been changed for 30 years. It takes a lot of people from a broad coalition to do this. There are a lot of people who have been in Congress for decades, longer than the gentleman and I have been living in some cases.

A lot of people like the way things are done today. They like the current rules. It makes it easier to filter power through your committee, to filter power through this institution. But these rules have really accomplished one thing. The budgets we set for the Federal Government every year we pass a budget resolution are very easily and very quickly circumvented. They do not stick. They do not count, and they do not work.

If we can fix our budget process, bring common sense back to it, real legal enforcement measures so that the budget is easy to enforce, we can accomplish these goals of not only balancing the budget, making sure huge tax increases do not hit the American people, but prepare our entitlement programs for that baby boom retirement without having to resort to deep benefit cuts or huge tax increases.

We have to avoid the kind of malaise and troubles that other countries like those in Europe have fallen into where they have to keep taxing and taxing and taxing their people with payroll taxes and business taxes and value added taxes, and they have chronic unemployment of 9 to 12 percent.

We do not want to go down that road. We have to prepare to make sure we do not go down that road as these demographics confront us with the retirement of the baby boomers. If we are going to confront that, if we are going to pass legislation to do that, we have to budget for it. And we have to have a budget that is enforceable. The current rules make that nearly impossible. That is why you have this great coalition in Congress that is serious about doing this this year to enforce these rules.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for his leadership in bringing a whole host of Members of Congress to the table to take this issue seriously. I look forward to working with my colleague from Illinois to working on this as soon as this budget resolution is done, to move a bill through the Committee on the Budget, and to get it to the House floor and to fight those interests who like the status quo.

I think we can prevail. I know we can prevail and I sure hope we do. And it is

only with this kind of coalition that the gentleman has helped assemble that will give us a chance of prevailing.

Mr. KIRK. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN). Our districts abut and it does prove that there is some common wisdom that comes from America's heartland.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KIRK. As our special operators/warriors will no doubt note, our government has the primary duty given by the Founding Fathers to provide for our common defense; but if we fail, then all of our other duties are failed.

In the last century, we, Republicans and Democrats, Americans, added a second mission to our Federal Government. And that was to provide for the retirement security of Americans who worked hard and became members of what we now call "The Greatest Generation" that saved the world from fascism.

□ 2130

These commitments to protect our families and older Americans call on most of the resources of the Federal Government. If we cannot afford to meet those commitments, we fail the most fundamental bond between Americans and their government. These commitments are on such a massive scale and duration that it calls on us all to be fiscal conservatives. We know that the Federal Government cannot do everything, but it can and must meet the duties of national and retirement security wealth.

In our history, we have not built a perfect record of balanced budgets. This chart shows some of the history, and you see for a lot of our history we have not had a balanced budget, deep deficits obviously during World War II and parts of the Cold War.

Most of our deficits early in our history dealt with whether the country was at war or at peace, but the deficits of later years have something entirely different at fault.

In the 19th century, this Congress faced entirely the opposite problem. We had a high tariff against foreign goods, and that hurt our economy, but built up a massive Federal surplus. In the 20th century, we built up massive debts, but they were largely to fight and win the world wars. Our debts consumed a fifth of the Nation's income, but I think they were absolutely necessary to secure victories in 1918 and 1945.

The Korean War, the mounting cost of the Cold War and the Vietnam War did push the Federal Government into the red. These costs were staggering and seemed never ending until the Cold War was ended on America's terms in 1991.

Our national security duties faded, but only briefly until forced by other challenges in Kuwait and Haiti and Bosnia and Kosovo. But these challenges hid a growing structural change in the way our government spent the taxpayers' funds.

Imagine a rain barrel. Water inside represents Federal tax dollars. A pipe above the rain barrel brings in more water, Federal tax receipts. If we raise taxes, the pipe gets bigger and more water goes into the barrel. If we cut taxes, we narrow that pipe.

Around this mythical barrel are 13 ladles. These ladles represent the 13 regular appropriations bills. These bills are used to fund the traditional part of the Federal Government. Each part of our government from the FBI to the FAA to the FDA is supplied out of these 13 bills.

For most of our government's history, these 13 bills, represented by the 13 ladles around our barrel, were how we funded Washington; but in the 20th century, we invented entitlement programs, programs making beneficiaries entitled to Federal spending, for example, Americans over 65 entitled to health care under Medicare.

The best way to think about these entitlement programs is to imagine they are holes drilled in the bottom of the barrel. Expand an entitlement program, as we did giving a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, and you widen the hole in the bottom of the barrel.

The analogy of our rain barrel with holes drilled in its side leads us to a clear picture of what is happening to the Federal budget. We are spending more money through automatic spending of entitlements than we are through the regular appropriations bills, the ladles I talked about. We are spending a lot more through entitlements.

Our budget this year will total \$2.5 trillion. Only \$820 billion, roughly one-third of the budget, will be spent under the regular appropriations bills of the Congress. Two-thirds of our budget will be spent in automatic spending through entitlement programs. Our entitlement programs increase their spending even when we do not improve benefits. That is because the number of people entitled to these programs is rising.

Today, roughly 35 million Americans have most of their health care paid by Medicare, but America's baby boomers are aging, and since the first baby boomer was born in 1946, they become eligible for Social Security and Medicare in just 5 years. The number of people eligible will rise from 35 million to over 70 million. This increase in beneficiaries puts an enormous strain on our budget.

Americans should know that our government uses different accounting rules than a private company. If a company promises a pension to one of its employees, it must show the cost of that promise for the entire life of the retiree on the company's books. But that is not how the Federal Government works. We only calculate the cost of our pension promises for the next year, and we estimate the cost of our promises over 5 years.

This method of government accounting leaves much of our financial posi-

tion in the dark, where Americans cannot learn what is being done on our behalf. If you were an accountant for the Federal Government and you accounted for our finances the way any family-owned business in America does, then it would show that our government is \$30 trillion in the red.

Many politicians, like one of those that just spoke on the floor this evening, talked about the surplus of the 1990s. The surplus existed only on paper. It did not stand up to analysis. Every dollar of the so-called 1990 surplus and more was needed to honor the promises that have already been made by our government.

So where do we go from here? First, we begin where I began by looking at the two basic commitments of our Federal Government, that we provide for the national defense and we provide for retirement security. National defense in time of terror is not cheap. Our victory in Afghanistan was won by a sea-borne Army against a country with no coastline. Such victories are possible, but not inexpensive.

In the post-September 11 world, we could not guarantee that every terrorist in the United States had been caught, and therefore, we were forced to defend the homeland at great cost. For example, an airport screening machine costs \$2 million and O'Hare Airport needed 50, requiring \$100 million to secure just one of the Nation's 4,000 airports.

Like our grandmothers and -fathers of World War II, we had to protect our families, even with borrowed money. That was necessary in the edgy days after September 11, but now it is time to return to a bottom line so that we can ensure that our capacity for honoring those most basic commitments can be met. This House must review a budget to meet our most important obligations while returning our finances to balance.

The Congress will consider several budgets this week, from both sides of the political aisle. I have my preferences, but we stand here tonight to make a more basic point, above partisan rhetoric in a presidential year.

Process matters as much as policy. We have a choice between adopting a budget and not. If we do not adopt a budget, the record of the Congress is clear that we will spend much more than otherwise. Our history shows that we spend less with a budget plan than without. Ironically, any budget plan is more fiscally responsible than no budget plan. This sets a bipartisan imperative that, in the end, the common good is served when we come together on a revenue and spending budget plan.

My second point on process is even more obvious. We must not only adopt a budget, we must enforce it. Far too often, Congress has made tough decisions on a budget and then waived its restrictions in end-of-year legislation or additional supplemental appropriations bills.

This week, Congress will debate a budget and will debate all sorts of spe-

cific numbers on defense and veterans and the Environmental Protection Agency and the like, but once we adopt a budget, we must make a change. We must make sure that we add tools to both the executive and legislative branches to make it easier to enforce the budget we have already passed.

Here in Congress, we have subdivisions between Democrats and Republicans; and Democrats are further subdivided into liberal progressives, main line and conservative Blue Dog factions. Republicans are also divided between conservative study group Republicans and moderate Main Street Republicans. I am a member of the moderate Main Street Republican group, and the problem of balancing our budget is so important that we have not let divisions divide our rank and file.

Republican moderates and conservatives joined together to talk about and put forward 12 consensus principles to reduce spending. These principles were drafted into legislation.

One bill, H.R. 3925, was authored by myself, cosponsored by 17 of my colleagues. My learned colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) authored the other major piece of legislation on this with 80 cosponsors.

We set forth some basic principles: that budgets should be enforceable in law; that if we are estimated to miss our targets, then we should have automatic spending reductions to reassure taxpayers and markets that what our budget said it would do it will actually do. We should not put in superfluous numbers that are ignored by the political process, but numbers that count, and those are a number for the Committee on Appropriations, a number for entitlement programs and especially that rainy day fund number.

We know that this country will go through hurricanes and floods and fires. We even know some of the national security challenges we will face. We need to plan for that now so that we can control our budget.

Our budgets presented to us now under the old pro-spending rules automatically include an inflation adjustment that hides spending increases. We need to show the American people exactly how much we spent last year and how much we are going to spend next year without any inflation adjustments. We need to also block spending outside the budget, with pay-as-you-go rules, to make sure that anyone proposing a program which costs more is forced to actually have a way of actually cutting another program to pay for their increase.

We must make sure that we cut pork barrel spending programs by learning the lessons from the Supreme Court and from the military base closing legislation to allow the President to send up a list of rescissions that can be presented for a clean up-or-down vote in the people's House to make sure that we can knock out pork barrel spending included in large bills by powerful Members of Congress.

We need to show the government's full debts and liabilities to make sure the American people know that right now we stand \$31 trillion in debt and we cannot afford to add any more new programs or new spending. We must clearly show the debt owed to our public, and most importantly, for the rules of the Congress, they need to be the actual rules that cannot be waived.

I am very happy to be joined here not just by my colleague from Wisconsin, but also my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) who has led on this and helped us come to a broad-based conclusion on how we fund bipartisan reform to make sure that when we pass a budget we actually stick to it.

First, I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I only wanted to say that we have now added some Members from the other side of the aisle to our legislation so they have become true pieces of bipartisanship. That is the right step in the right direction. That is the critical ingredient we need to get critical mass to pass these things.

But I also wanted to recognize our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) as well, who is also a very, very strident Member in making sure that we live within our means, a good fiscal conservative. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if there are any comments he would like to make on this subject.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss and join the discussion on a matter that I think should be of grave concern to every American taxpayer, every American worker, every American that relies on an essential Federal program that they look to on a daily basis and any American that basically looks to our Federal Government to provide for our safety and security, and that is, I join with my colleagues in discussing this issue of fiscal responsibility on the Federal level. It is one that you and I agree is long overdue, as Washington begins to put its house in order, and that we need to do it obviously in the sense that if we want to continue to provide those essential services back to our districts, those services that people have a right to under the Constitution and look to the Federal Government for, we have to put those processes in place.

So, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chance to join with my good friend from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and thank him for all the work he has done on this issue in the past, basically, this evening to bring to the American public's attention the issue of fiscal responsibility and process to the system.

□ 2145

Madam Speaker, it has been discussed already here and in the past

that we are looking at a \$521 billion budget deficit right now, meaning we are sending out \$521 billion more than we are taking in at the end of the day. I stand up here as a freshman, and \$521 billion is an awful lot of money to me. I come from the good State of New Jersey, where when I go back and talk to businesses there, they obviously would never be able to operate their business on a basis like we do in Washington.

Even in our State government, where I had the honor of serving for the last 12 years, we did not have the opportunity to operate in the manner that Congress has over the years. We had to do the fiscally responsible thing, and that is to end up at the end of the year with a balanced budget.

I have the privilege and honor of being on the Committee on the Budget, and we just went through 2 days of hearing, and this past week we passed through the budget that we will soon be considering in this House. We discussed the issue of fiscal responsibility during the course of that markup. But I think it is interesting to know that during the debate and during that time we got that bill out of committee, the Members on the other side of the aisle, still understanding where we stand with regard to the budget deficits, still proposed spending and sending out \$28 billion more than we see in the budget that will be coming before us.

I do not know whether those tactic were simply playing politics or whether the other side of the aisle honestly does not care about spending more than we are taking in, but I think it sets a bad example either way.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, if I understand correctly, the gentleman is saying that minority members of the committee offered amendments that would have cost the taxpayers an extra \$28 billion, which the Republicans defeated?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Exactly. Each and every one of those amendments came up, and Members on the other side of the aisle made their best case as to why we should be spending more money than we are taking in. Fortunately, members on this side of the aisle said it would not be fiscally responsible to do those programs and at the end of the day not have money available to provide the essentials.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, could the gentleman share with us what the budget that was passed out does with respect to the deficit over the next 5 years?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. It cuts that deficit in half, which goes in the correct direction. That is to say what we talked about, the area of trying to get to a balanced budget some day, we have to do it by reining in spending, and this goes to doing that not by raising taxes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. And that was done without raising taxes?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Exactly. That is an important point we need to get to as well. At the end of the

day, we want to grow the economy. One of the points that I think I have learned here and in State government, when you cut taxes, you return those dollars from Washington back to the family budget. Families have the ability to spend more; consumer confidence goes up. They spend more locally, businesses are able to expand, jobs are created; and at the end of the day, not only do you expand the economy, but by putting more people back to work and expanding the economy, you reduce the amount of the reliance on the Federal Government, and so you reduce the amount of money that we have to spend. So eventually you will be able to reduce taxes even further.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. There is more money coming into the Federal Government because more people are working and paying taxes.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, some tough choices were made. The overall budget, outside of the Department of Defense, froze Federal spending. Some will say that is a cut, but actually the same level of financing was provided that we did last year as a part of fiscal discipline.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Actually we are doing a level funding plan. If a program had this much money this year, we are going to keep it level going into the future.

Mr. KIRK. Is that a cut?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. That is absolutely not a cut. A cut is when you are spending this much this year, and next year you go down to here. That is a cut. If we keep it level, I do not know how anyone can call that a cut.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to look at this budget plan coming up, and people may differ with the details of the budget, but my understanding is this budget cuts the deficit as a percentage of GNP by half. We may want a more aggressive action by the Committee on the Budget; but in a time of national security crisis with so many Americans in uniform still on the field, we have some pressing national security needs that we need to make sure that we meet our obligations to Americans in uniform. So this budget sends us in the right direction, but we only meet that right direction if we actually enforce the budget that we put in place.

The series of reforms that we put in in H.R. 3925, or other pieces of legislation, reform legislation, I think are essential to make sure that we assure markets and taxpayers that we actually mean what we say, that we hit our targets that we have told everybody in the budget resolution that we are going to do, and so that people take the word of Congress very directly.

I wanted to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for joining me. This will be a very hot debate in Congress with regard to the specifics of the budget; but the debate is not over, and we have not completed our full mission until we

have actually also passed reforms to make sure that it is much easier and not harder to enforce the budget which has actually been adopted by the Congress.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for spending an hour, although I do not quite agree with some of the facts that the gentleman stated.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I will say that the gentleman is an absolute leader on human rights around the world, and on that we completely agree.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, on that I echo the kudo.

I am joined tonight by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). I anticipate that we will be shortly joined by two other colleagues, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) as well as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), for another session that we have labeled as Iraq Watch to discuss issues concerning the Middle East with a particular focus on Iraq, Afghanistan, and the war on terror.

There is much to talk about tonight. I do not think an hour will be sufficient. I also should mention over the course of the past 8 months, and we have been doing this for approximately 8 months now, I know that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the other Members involved have received a number of calls, e-mails, correspondence from not just our own constituents but from all over the country. There is one question that is constantly asked, and that is why is the House empty at this hour of the night.

I think we should explain to those viewing this evening that the legislative business of the House of Representatives has been concluded for the day and we are now into a phase that is called Special Orders. Each side of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, are allocated an hour, actually two hours, to just have a conversation or make a presentation about issues that they have a particular interest in or issues which they feel the American people need more information on. I am sure many who watch C-SPAN note that during the course of the debate on particular proposals, the time is very limited, given the numbers of Members that wish to speak. In fact, the usual course allows for at most a maximum of some 5 minutes for each Member to speak. On those issues that have a particular interest on both sides of the aisle, what occurs is the individual Member who happens to be managing the bill, either Republican or Democrat, is responsible for allocating time

and often rather than 5 minutes, the likelihood is that a Member will only have 2 or 3 minutes to explain his or her perspective on a particular issue.

So this phase is called Special Orders. Earlier there were three of our friends and colleagues from the Republican side who discussed the budget. Prior to their coming to the floor, three or four Democratic Members spoke about the budget and the perspective of Democrats as to the proposal put forth by the Republican Party, and also clearly an alternative that will be presented by the Democrats in terms of the debate on where we go as far as a Nation is concerned, because in many respects the budget does reflect our values. And as Members heard earlier from our colleagues on the Republican side, there is a growing and profound concern about the escalating deficit that has been brought about by the actions of this particular administration and this Republican majority in both the House and the Senate.

I think it is important that the American people remember that the Republican Party controls the House of Representatives, controls the United States Senate, and obviously the current incumbent in the White House is a Republican. So when we speak of deficits, this is a deficit that was engendered by the majority party in this country. I know the Democrats are extremely concerned about the deficit because the interest that is paid on the national debt detracts from other investments that could be made in a wide variety of initiatives such as infrastructure, education, health care, and a long litany of issues that I believe are a priority to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, just to follow up on the comment and the discussion of the deficit, it is not only Democrats who are concerned with the deficit; it is Republicans as well. Last night I was in a town hall meeting attended by about 150 people in Snohomish County, Washington, and I had a fellow stand up who said he was a Republican and was extremely concerned that this government, which he understood was controlled by the Republican Party lock, stock and barrel, was running up these enormous deficit. His basic question was, What is going on? He was flabbergasted to see that happening.

What I had to tell him was the news was actually worse than he had heard. He had heard the number that the Republican government had run up a \$500 billion deficit, and it bothered him. It bothered him even more when I told him the deficit was actually higher than that because the administration and the Congress to some degree have played with some funny numbers that make Enron blush how accounting is done.

One example, I had to tell him the President's budget, which has been for-

warded to the Congress proposing expenditures for next year, omitted any sums for fighting the Iraq war, any sums for fighting the Afghanistan war. You can kind of understand how a government can run up giant deficits, the largest deficits in American history if they play funny games of sending up budgets when we are in the middle of a war spending \$100 billion a year in Iraq, or a little short of that, and then assess zero cost to that.

I just cannot understand, this administration must not think anybody can read in America when they try to play games like that. I can inform the White House that my Democrat and Republican constituents are very aware of this and are very concerned about it.

□ 2200

Let me turn, if I can, to the Iraq issue which we have now been talking about for some months.

The reason we are here is twofold: One, our proud men and women are doing a job in Iraq tonight which all Americans are proud of. Over 500 of them have paid the ultimate sacrifice to the duty to which they pledged honor to our country. Their sacrifice demands that the government of the United States tell the truth to the American people about what happened in Iraq and why this war started, based on false information.

Just to set the stage for our discussion tonight, I would like to point out at least some of that false information that ended up starting this war. I want to be very specific on this so no one can say that we have gilded the lily.

The fact is, sadly, that on March 17, 2003, the President of the United States of America went before the American people and in an address to the Nation said, and I quote, "Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised." That statement was false and the information gathered over a year of spending over \$100 million of seeking with a fine-toothed comb in Iraq has demonstrated with some conviction that that statement was false, unfortunately.

On August 2, 2002, the Vice President of the United States, DICK CHENEY, went before the Veterans of Foreign Wars and stated, "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction." That statement was false, false both on the issue of the presence of weapons of mass destruction as indicated by Mr. David Kay, who was the person hired by this country to find out, but also false in saying there was no doubt, because a review by this Chamber, by the three of us and others, has showed there was plenty of doubt about this issue in Iraq that was covered up, was suppressed by this administration.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think it is important to remember that when the Director of the CIA testified recently before

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he acknowledged that on several occasions he privately spoke to both the President and on multiple occasions spoke to the Vice President about errors that they had made in terms of misstatements, let us use that term for the moment, misstatements, yet we have heard nothing specifically from the Vice President. And the gentleman alluded to the incident earlier, being forthright with the American people that subsequently he received information from George Tenet in private that corrected a public statement that he had made, and yet he does not acknowledge that today publicly.

Mr. INSLEE. Let me, if I can, say why that is a problem. We need the administration to fulfill its obligation to the American people to help get to the bottom of what happened in this situation. The fact is, I will indicate in just a moment, every single chance we have had to peel back the onion and peel back the draperies to find out what happened, this administration has continued to suppress information.

I want to give the gentleman this one example. On January 28, 2003, the President went before the Nation in the State of the Union address, stood right behind where the gentleman is standing right now and said, "The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production."

That statement was false. The reason we know that is that the person sent by the administration to Africa to find out whether it was true or not, Ambassador Joe Wilson, who, at the request of the administration, went to Africa and reported back before the State of the Union address that that was a bunch of hokum, it was a bunch of malarkey, and it was false.

And the President, in the State of the Union, despite that specific response from our intelligence service, if you will, or someone acting in their behalf, put it in the State of the Union anyway, or someone on his behalf.

Everybody can make mistakes. We are all human. But let us see what this administration's response to this falsehood and disclosure of falsehood was. Was it a thank you to Mr. Wilson for helping us get to the bottom of this? Was it a further inquiry to find out who was responsible for putting this gross misstatement in the State of the Union address? No.

What did they do? They tried to punish Joe Wilson, the citizen who did his patriotic duty to disclose this misstatement, by outing his wife who worked for the CIA, attempting to destroy her CIA career, to send a message to the world and to America, "Don't tell the truth about this administration because we'll attempt to destroy you." That is what they have attempted to do.

Thank goodness there is a grand jury investigating what could be a Federal crime here, because this is a pattern with this administration. Look what is happening tonight.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman makes reference to the question of a grand jury. I believe that if one takes an oath to speak before a committee of the Congress or one that is authorized by the Congress and the executive, that one is subject to perjury. I believe that is the case.

I would have to defer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I suppose, on the question of prosecution of that, but we have a commission now, the so-called 9/11 Commission, which is now meeting, and there have been severe criticisms that amount to open accusations that Mr. Richard Clarke, referred to in various ways by different officials in the administration as someone who apparently, if one is to believe the designations attached to him by members of the administration, is lying. Not distorting, not misinterpreting, not misunderstanding, not having a different point of view, not engaged in an academic exercise of confrontation and different contending visions of what might have taken place, but on the contrary, specifically that Mr. Clarke is lying, that he is not telling the truth.

I believe Mr. Clarke is going to testify to the Commission tomorrow. I am not familiar with whether or not the witnesses taking the stand there in front of that Commission are under oath. But given the seriousness of the circumstances, I certainly hope that they are.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think that we should remind the audience that the gentleman from Hawaii has just joined us. In terms of what Mr. Clarke testifies to tomorrow, I think we should suspend our judgment tonight.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I have no difficulty with that. My point here was in response to the gentleman from Washington's observation that there is at least one grand jury meeting right now.

Mr. DELAHUNT. One grand jury that we are aware of.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That is what I say, at least one meeting now. Perhaps there may be more. My point is that there are so many accusations with respect to why, how, when, should we, et cetera, having to do with Iraq that you simply cannot continue to assassinate the personalities or the characters of the various individuals that we have been citing and at some point not say, look, somebody's either telling the truth or not, and let's put it to the test.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Does this come as a surprise to the gentleman?

Let us be honest among ourselves and with those people that are viewing. If the gentleman remembers, it was the Bush-Cheney campaign that back in

2000 during the primary season, there was an ad that ran in New York. It was a 60-second radio spot in the days before the primary which was March 7 of 2000.

Let me just give the gentleman a condensed version of that ad:

Hello. My name is Geri Barish and I am a breast cancer survivor. It is a woman introducing herself to the listening audience. Like many, I had thought of supporting JOHN MCCAIN in next week's presidential primary. So I looked into his record.

What I discovered was shocking. JOHN MCCAIN opposes many projects dedicated to women's health issues.

It's true. MCCAIN opposes funding for vital breast cancer programs right here in New York. JOHN MCCAIN calls these projects just "garden variety pork." That's shocking.

The truth, of course, was that Senator MCCAIN did not vote against this bill because of the breast cancer projects, but because it was a military spending bill that did not provide adequate increases, in his judgment, for our troops.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). The gentleman is reminded to please not make references to individual Senators.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I apologize to the Chair.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, point of inquiry to the Chair. So that we can be sure that we do not violate any of the rules, I believe the gentleman was not making specific reference. He was referring to an article by way of reference. He was not referring directly. He was reporting something else.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I will eliminate reference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For clarification, the gentleman is not allowed to quote material that makes references to an individual Senator that would be out of order if spoken in his own words.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the Chair. What I want to explain is that in this particular case, the attack on Senator MCCAIN failed to mention that his sister was a breast cancer survivor.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, because I do not want to incur the ire of the Chair, I think what we need to do here, and perhaps the Chair can enlighten us if we are in violation, if we would refer to a Senator unnamed who happened to be running for President at a particular time, people can make their own reference. Is that allowed?

Mr. DELAHUNT. From the State of Arizona, I would add.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Parliamentarian indicates that the gentleman should refrain from making references to individual Senators.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Again, I thank the Chair.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. We do not want to violate anything. We would not refer

to a particular Senator, but at least one Senator ran for President in the last election. Can we do that? Can we at least refer to the fact that there was a Senator who ran in the last election?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. General references may be made without referencing an individual Senator.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the Chair. I appreciate the Chair taking the time to make that clear.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can, what I am going to do is what is rather boldly stated here on the cover of Time magazine in February, when the question is posed, and I would suggest that the question is now being posed in very real terms as we witness the string of revelations that are occurring now on an everyday basis: Believe Him Or Not: Does Bush Have a Credibility Gap?

This is about credibility. It is not just about the President, because the President speaks for the United States. The President's credibility becomes our credibility. Not Republican credibility, not Democratic credibility, but the credibility of the United States in a very dangerous moment in world history, when we are all united to defeat terrorism.

There was a fascinating story in my hometown paper, the Boston Globe, this morning. I think it is worthy to present it to the gentleman tonight and to have the viewing audience listen.

The former chief U.S. weapons inspector in Iraq warned yesterday that the United States is in grave danger of destroying its credibility at home and abroad if it does not own up to our mistakes in Iraq.

□ 2215

That is David Kay. That is the individual who universally has received praise and respect from policymakers and people involved in this particular issue. He was appointed by this White House, this administration, to lead a team to go to Iraq and determine whether there were weapons of mass destruction. It is he now that is imploring this White House, this President, this Vice President, to use his words, to "come clean with the American people" because, as he points out, the cost of our mistakes with regard to the explanation of why we went to war in Iraq are far greater than Iraq itself. This issue is so profound that it is now the credibility of the United States, the prestige that we have earned through decades, through the centuries, that is at risk.

"We are in grave danger of having destroyed our credibility internationally and domestically with regard to warning about future events. The answer is to admit you were wrong, and what I find most disturbing about Washington is the belief you can never admit you are wrong."

It is like I indicated earlier, there have been newspaper reports that the director of the CIA, Mr. Tenet, privately corrected the Vice President on

his statements linking Saddam Hussein to al Qaeda. And yet the Vice President has not had the decency to come forward to the American people and say, I was wrong, when I was wrong.

And in another interview Mr. Kay goes on, and when asked what his opinion was of the statement of Vice President CHENEY that weapons of mass destruction might still be found in Iraq, his response was, "What worries me about Cheney's statements is I think people who hold out for a Hail Mary pass delay the inevitable looking back at what went wrong." That is what this 9/11 commission is hearing this week. The message that we send out to the rest of the world is that we are strong and a mature democracy if we tell the truth, and we will not have a credibility gap.

I believe we have enough evidence now to say that the intelligence process and the policy process obviously crafted by the President, President Bush, and Vice President CHENEY that used that information did not work at the level of effectiveness that we require in the age we live in. I mean, this is absolutely the most profound issue, in my judgment, that is currently confronting the United States with long-term implications.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, it is quite clear that Mr. Kay is clearly taking the high road in terms of his characterization of what took place and is giving the broadest benefit of a doubt with respect to whether there were misinterpretations or misunderstandings as to what the true facts were and what the implications of those facts were in terms of whether we went into Iraq or not.

Others have a different interpretation. I quite agree with the gentleman that this is the most profound issue that we have faced perhaps in our lifetime because we have to go all the way back to the Nixon Administration to find a situation in which there was a deliberate misleading of the American people as to what the facts were with a given situation, in this instance the general question of Watergate, everything that that implied and involved. But at least there what was being done was a cover-up, essentially, of rather sordid and almost banal and mundane political machinations. The rather sad spectacle of the President of the United States engaged in third-rate theatrics, burglaries, false presentations as to where money came from and where it went and so on, sordid and stupid and tawdry.

But in this instance, I would posit for my friend and for those who are listening, in this instance we have accusations made that there was a deliberate undertaking geared towards moving this Nation to war, a preemptive war, based on information and perspectives

presented to the American public which were untrue, were known to be untrue, and were in fact the ideological leanings of a small group of people determined to take this Nation into war with Iraq regardless of whether it served either the strategic interests of this Nation or whether it satisfied anybody's definition by any measure of the truth.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I think the proper characterization, I heard one of our colleagues at a town meeting say to one of our colleagues never in this country have so many been misled by so few, and now we are going to find the truth as to why that happened. And the reason we are going to find the truth are two principles: principle number one, facts are stubborn things; and, two, the truth comes out. It is coming out now, and it has come out yesterday on television, and it is coming out tomorrow in the commission.

I want to read some of this truth that I believe we are going to hear. The question is whether or not this administration was compelled by intelligence reports of weapons of mass destruction that forced them to action in Iraq or whether this administration had a preconceived judgment and decision to go after Iraq and then went looking for something to substantiate that preconceived decision to the American public. And it is the latter, and we know it is the latter, because every day more and more truth is leaking out of this White House.

What did we hear last night? We heard in a book by Mr. Richard Clarke, who was the White House's former counterterrorism chief, a pretty high individual in the White House who is responsible for counterterrorism, which was quoted in the New York Times, where he said that Mr. Bush pressed him, Mr. Clarke, three times to find evidence that Iraq was behind the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The accusation is explosive because no such link has ever been proved. Mr. Clarke says, quoting the President, "I want you, as soon as you can, to go back over everything, everything." Mr. Clarke writes, and Mr. Bush told him "See if Saddam did this. See if he's linked in any way." When Mr. Clarke protested that the culprit was al Qaeda, not Iraq, Mr. Bush "testily ordered" him, he writes, to "look into Iraq's Saddam," and then left the room; then demanded a report, which was prepared, which came back and gave the same answer that there was not a meaningful connection between al Qaeda and Iraq, sent the report up the chain from CIA and FBI. It got bounced back and sent back saying, "wrong answer, do it again."

A war was started on a false premise of a connection between Iraq and al

Qaeda, and the truth as to why that happened is coming out. Basically, as far as I can tell, the White House's principle is that their Secretary of the Treasury, who essentially said pretty much the same thing, that it had been Iraq, Iraq, Iraq even before September 11. Their counterterrorism chief, Richard Clarke, who said on the day of the attack they said let us go get Iraq and try to gin up some evidence to support this, in a manner of speaking; Joe Wilson, who was sent by this administration to find out whether this is a bill of goods about this uranium that got into the State of the Union address, the White House is saying that all these people who worked for the White House in these high positions have no clue as to what was going on. As far as I can tell, what the White House says is their position is nobody who ever worked in the White House has a clue as to what went on there because whatever they said has got to be wrong. And now, instead of welcoming a critical analysis as to what went wrong here and where the foul-up is, what is this administration doing?

According to the New York Times, the way they characterize it, and I think it is fair, they have "opened an aggressive personal attack against its former counterterrorism chief, Richard Clarke." What did they do to Joe Wilson, the ambassador who found out that they told a falsehood in the State of the Union address? They tried to destroy his wife's career. What did they do to their former Secretary of the Treasury, who said essentially that they had been trying to go after Iraq from day one in the administration? And I paraphrase a little bit, but generally that was the thrust. They attacked him personally.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, but these are all actions that are directed at individuals. And I abhor them, and somebody should be held responsible. It is as if there is another enemies list.

The gentleman alluded earlier to the Nixon years. There is something Nixonian about targeting individuals, attacking them, attacking them at a personal level, and clearly trying to undermine their professionalism and hurt their careers. We have seen it again and again.

I began earlier with the radio spot that was used during the course of the Presidential election, the one that was masterminded obviously by Karl Rove, who is the political adviser and I am sure consults with the President on a regular basis. But the gentleman talked about former Secretary O'Neill. Mr. Clarke now. What happened to General Shinseki when he suggested that there was need for 2 to 300,000 troops if the peace was to be won in Iraq? He was castigated in an extremely dismissive way by Under Secretary Paul Wolfowitz.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, he was publicly rebuked, the chief of staff of the Army who had come up, I will tell the Members, from the ranks. I happen to know about General Shinseki because he is a true son of Hawaii. The son of humble people whose family was interned in World War II for the crime of being Japanese Americans, who served our country from the ranks on up to becoming chief of staff of the Army, was rebuked by this little man.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, again as I indicated, I sympathize with these individuals, and I am confident that as time moves on, because America is truly about, at its essence, the search for the truth, that they will be vindicated. What I would submit is that time is vindicating them now, whether it be Mr. Clarke or whether it be David Kay.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Hans Blix.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Hans Blix. They are all being vindicated. But really what is at stake here is the prestige and the credibility of the United States.

We heard a lot in the debate last week about appeasement. There is no appeasement when it comes to terrorism. We are all united, Republican, Democrat. I cannot imagine one Member of this House not being adamant that we pursue justice and that we win the war on terror. But if we continue to have our credibility undermined by this White House, we risk losing the war on terror.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, frankly, again, I want to reiterate we are all human and we have all made mistakes and every administration has made mistakes in the past, and we ought to be somewhat understanding of that. But this administration has been an abject failure in helping us find out what happened here and finding responsibility for those and taking action to hold them accountable so we can demonstrate to the world and to the American people that we are not going to countenance starting wars based on falsehood.

□ 2230

Let us look at the record of this administration in that regard.

How many people have been held to account for the fact that a war started based on false information? How many people? The answer? Zero. Zero. Five hundred people have lost their lives in Iraq, but zero people has George Bush held accountable for this false information, and it is wrong. Only one person in America has lost their job over this false information, and that was a radio talk show host.

We need accountability for this mistake, and this administration needs to get busy, instead of stonewalling and covering up the truth, to help us find the truth and find who is accountable.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let us hope that they listened to David Kay, who is exploring them to come clean with the

American people. It is so important, because, well, let us look at the most recent example.

If we are serious about the war on terrorism, we need to have the respect and cooperation and commitment of the entire world. If you remember, in the aftermath of September 11 there was information that came pouring into the United States about al Qaeda cells in some 60 different countries. In fact, we heard there were dozens of al Qaeda cells operating right here in the United States.

What is happening now? The most recent statement by one of those nations that actually participated and has a number of troops in Iraq today, and I refer to the Polish nation, their President said, "We were misled. They took us for a ride." That is his quote.

The Spaniards, we are castigated by our friends for appeasement. I thought that was rather arrogant, considering the fact that the Spanish have dealt for years attempting to rid their nation of the terrorists who claim to be seeking independence, the so-called ETA.

I found very interesting in the aftermath of the election in Spain that the new leader there declared that his most immediate priority will be to fight terrorism. There was a disagreement that Iraq was a distraction, that we went after the wrong enemy. And more and more people are coming to that belief.

The South Koreans just this past week indicated that they did not want their troops transported to a venue that would most likely create a potential where they would be engaged in violence.

The problem is, this is not about appeasement; this is about credibility in winning the war on terror.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman will yield, the question you are asking is what Americans are asking all over the country. Yesterday, one of my constituents asked, I thought, a very interesting question. He said, after September 11, who did the President focus on? According to Paul O'Neill, the Secretary of the Treasury, including the President's own counterterrorism chief, Richard Clark, the answer was Iraq.

What my constituent asked me then, he said, well, you know, 15 out of the 19 hijackers were from Saudi Arabia. Did the President ever ask about Saudi Arabia, the country where historically a lot of these companies he has had dealings with in the oil and gas industry are? No. He never asked about Saudi Arabia. Iraq, Iraq.

I wanted to read what the counterterrorism chief says happened, because it is important, in trying to find out whether they focused on Iraq without justification.

Mr. Richard Clark said, "Mr. Rumsfeld was saying we needed to bomb Iraq, and we all said no, no, al Qaeda is in Afghanistan; we need to bomb Afghanistan. And Mr. Rumsfeld said, there aren't any good targets in Afghanistan, and there are lots of good

targets in Iraq. I said, well, there are a lot of good targets in a lot of places, but Iraq has nothing to do with it."

This is the counterterrorism chief of the White House. He went on: "Initially, I thought when he said there aren't enough targets in Afghanistan, I thought he was joking. Initially, I think that they wanted to believe that there was a connection, but the CIA was sitting there, the FBI was sitting there, I was sitting there, saying we have looked at this issue for years; for years we have looked, and there is just no connection."

This is the White House's counterterrorism chief telling the Secretary of Defense there is no connection between Iraq and al Qaeda.

And what did the President tell the American people over and over and over? He said essentially you cannot even think of them as distinct entities. He wanted to create a fear, to create an image in America that al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden had been morphed into Saddam Hussein, because he believed it was in the Nation's best interest, for whatever the reasons are.

But he did not have the right to tell these falsehoods to the American people. Now that the truth is coming up, he owes us an obligation to hold accountable in his administration whoever is responsible for this, and he owes us the obligation to stop stonewalling the distribution of truth to the American people, and he needs to come clean, as his arms inspector, David Kay, says he should do. This is an obligation to the people who are serving in Iraq tonight, our brothers and sons and daughters and husbands and wives.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Do you find it interesting that in the United Kingdom, and I disagreed with the Prime Minister there, Tony Blair. As you know, I voted against the resolution authorizing military action against Iraq. But I respect Tony Blair. He went before the Parliament, and for hour after hour after hour stood his ground in a respectful fashion and answered each question that was posed to him.

There is a commission going on right now. I would hope that the President would reconsider and go before that commission, not behind closed doors, but for the American people to hear, so that the credibility not just of President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, but the credibility of the United States can be restored and replicate exactly what the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom did in response to questions about the British role in Iraq.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman might be interested in the view of former President Carter in that regard.

In an interview today in the Independent, the British newspaper, the Independent reports that President Carter "strongly criticized" Mr. Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair "for waging an unnecessary war to oust Saddam Hussein, based on lies and misinterpretations."

This is not me speaking; this is former President Carter. This is not a reporter giving an editorial point of view. This is former President Carter.

I will repeat: "for waging an unnecessary war to oust Saddam Hussein, based on lies and misinterpretations. There was no reason for us to become involved in Iraq recently. That was a war based on lies and misinterpretations from London and from Washington claiming falsely that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the 9-11 attacks, claiming falsely that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. And I think that President Bush and Prime Minister Blair probably knew that many of the allegations were based on uncertain intelligence. A decision was made to go to war. Then people said, let's find a reason to do it."

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, you know, again if I can take the time for just a moment, what I would propose, because I understand that the 9/11 commission that is currently sitting here today has agreed to, and I think mistakenly, has agreed to a 1-hour interview with President Bush, and only two members of the commission are going to be entitled to inquire of him. That just simply continues to raise questions. It will be interpreted as a lack of being forthcoming.

What is necessary now, more than ever, as David Kay has said, let us open up. We are a democracy. I would go so far as a Democrat to suggest that the former President, President Clinton, and President Bush, go before that commission, one after another, sequentially, and stay there as long as there are questions to be asked regarding terrorism and the threat of terrorism to the United States. I would issue a challenge to both of them. Make it a bipartisan challenge. We have to take this out of the political realm.

Yes, I am not naive; I know there is a Presidential election, and these are issues that should be discussed in a Presidential election. But they have to be vetted in a forum such as a commission, where all of the answers are put out. And if there are mistakes that have been made, both during the Clinton administration and in this administration, the American people will be better off, and, more importantly, America's role in the world will once again be respected.

One only has to look at the polls. There was a recent study done, and I am not going to take the time, but let me just give you a quick example, and then one of you gentleman can close.

This is rating George Bush, but substitute George Bush for America. In Britain, our closest ally, the favorability of George Bush is 39 percent; the unfavorability is 57 percent. In France, the favorability is 15; 85 unfavorable. Fourteen percent favorable in Germany; 85 unfavorable. In Russia, 28 favorable; 60 unfavorable. In Turkey, 21 percent favorable; 67 percent unfavorable. Pakistan, 7 percent favorable; 67 percent unfavorable. In Jordan, 3 per-

cent favorable; and 96 percent unfavorable.

This is true all over the world, not just in the Mideast, but Asia, all over Latin America. It is about the United States. We need allies. We are finding that out. We need cooperation. We have got to win the war on terror. We cannot tolerate appeasement, but we should not be doing it alone.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman will yield, the obligation that I think is paramount, forgetting for the moment the need for allies, but the real paramount obligation is to the families who have lost loved ones in Iraq.

Now, the family I think of is one that I spent some time with last weekend who lost their husband and son in the Tigris River, a U.S. soldier awarded the Bronze Star for his heroism and service in Iraq. That family is owed an explanation by its government as to why their husband and son died in a conflict that was started based on false information from the Government of the United States, and that ought to be a bipartisan position that that obligation is owed.

Amongst questions that need to be answered are these: Why did the President of the United States of America and his administration 10 times on nine separate public appearances tell the American people that Saddam Hussein and Iraq had obtained aluminum tubes for use in a reconstituted nuclear program, when its own Department of Energy had told it that that was false before they made those statements?

How can they possibly now stonewall this information when we have already peeled back the onion to find out that the Department of Energy had told the White House that they were wrong about this claim and they still used it to start this war? That is a question this family is owed an answer to.

Second, why did this administration tell Americans that Iraq had developed these robot drone aircraft for the purpose of spraying chemical and biological weapons on us here in the continental United States when its own Air Force in analyzing the information had concluded that these robots were used for photography, not aerial spraying of biological and chemical weapons?

□ 2245

Why did the President of the United States authorize doing that, and if he did not do it, who did? Who did that? Because those people need to be held accountable, if necessary, with their jobs at least. This administration has done nothing of the sort.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield on that point, there is a lesson for all of us, and I think we have all said tonight, and if I have not said it yet, I will certainly reiterate the gentleman's point that we all make mistakes, we all have our weaknesses, we all have our elements of shortsightedness. But I will tell my colleagues this: as much as I opposed this attack on Baghdad and, as I

termed it at the time that a war would break out after we made this dash to Baghdad which is, in fact, what happened, as much as I opposed that, we bear responsibility too. And I want to indicate to people that we are down on this floor not just because we need to hear ourselves talk; we are down on this floor because this Congress needs to be accountable too. The very questions that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLIE) has been asking, this Congress should have been asking. We should not have allowed ourselves to be pushed into doing the most profound and fundamental thing that any Congress can do and that any President can do, which is take us into war. This should be a lesson to all of us, including and perhaps starting with the Congress.

The Constitution says only the Congress can declare war. When did it happen that we turned it over to the President to make his or her own decision on that issue? We have a responsibility, too; and I want to indicate to everybody, at least for this Member, and I think I am probably speaking for the other Members on the floor here, we intend to come back here, not because we are doing penance, but because we are doing oversight, the oversight that we should have done before. Maybe the same conclusion would have been arrived at, I do not know, I doubt it; but we should have been doing these things.

No commission should be looking into this right now. The plain fact is we should be looking into it, and that is what this Iraq Watch is going to do. We may not have the benefit of having the President in front of us or Mr. CHENEY or others, but we have the benefit of understanding what the revelations have been and what their meanings are and to search for the truth, and that is our obligation. And I hope that if nothing else comes out of all of this, that in future the Congress will take seriously its obligation and carry forward on the understanding that only the Congress can declare war; and it should be only done over the most thorough and complete examination as to what has taken place and what the strategic and moral interests of the United States are.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I am reminded of the words of Brent Scowcroft and others in the first Bush administration, those that served under President George Herbert Walker Bush, but particularly what Brent Scowcroft stated in a column that he wrote. He expressed a fear that a unilateral rush into a preemptive war would undercut worldwide support for the war on terror and cast America as an aggressor Nation for the first time in our history. Now, here is a gentleman, a lifelong Republican, presumably, a man well respected internationally, has an excellent reputation here in Washington as a serious person, a man of unimpeachable integrity. And I think we have all been saying in our own different ways what he said so elo-

quently. And sadly, we find ourselves in that very, very tragic moment where we are losing allies, we are losing the respect of the international community; friends are beginning to turn their backs on us. And, if that occurs, the war that we must win, the war on terror, is very much at risk.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week 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. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LYNCH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today and March 24.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and March 24 and 25.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and March 24 and March 30.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, March 24.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, March 24.

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. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 91st annual meeting of The Gar-

den Club of America; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 24, 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:

7220. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Private and Local Government Fleet Determination [Docket No. EE-RM-03-001] (RIN: 1904-AA98) received March 1, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7221. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Sta., Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products; Establishment Registration and Listing [Docket No. 97N-484R] received March 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7222. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Sta., Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products; Establishment Registration and Listing; Correction [Docket No. 97N-484R] received March 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7223. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution and Public Law 107-243 and Public Law 102-1, to help ensure that the Congress is kept informed on the status of United States efforts in the global war on terrorism; (H. Doc. No. 108-175); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

7224. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's Performance Budget Justification for FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7225. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act," pursuant to Public Law 107-273 section 202(a)(1)(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7226. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2002 Annual Report of the Office of the Police Corps and Law Enforcement Education, pursuant to Public Law 103-322; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7227. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the 2004 Trade Policy Agenda and 2003 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7228. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance

And Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2004 Annual Report Of The Board Of Trustees Of The Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance And The Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 108-176); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

7229. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oak Knoll District of Napa Valley Viticultural Area (2002R-046P) [T.D. TTB-9; Re: ATF Notice No. 947] (RIN: 1513-AA48) received March 10, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7230. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—2004 Calendar Year Resident Population Estimates [Notice 2004-21] received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7231. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Guidance Under Section 1502; Application of Section 108 to Members of a Consolidated Group [TD 9117] (RIN: 1545-BC96) received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7232. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, first-out inventories. (Rev. Rul. 2004-35) received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7233. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—New Markets Tax Credit Amendments [TD 9116] (RIN: 1545-BC02) received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7234. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Definition of Real Estate Investments Trust (Rev. Rul. 2004-24) received March 10, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7235. A letter from the SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Interrelationship of Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Program with the Railroad Retirement Program (RIN: 0960-AF82) received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7236. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2004 Annual Report Of The Boards Of Trustees Of The Federal Hospital Insurance And Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 108-177); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

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. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3966. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve the ability of the Department of Defense to establish and maintain Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps units at institutions of higher education, to improve the ability of students to participate in Senior ROTC programs, and to ensure that institutions of higher education provide military recruiters entry to campuses and access to students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided to any other employer; with amendments (Rept. 108-443, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. 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; with an amendment (Rept. 108-444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations, to improve children's nutritional health, and to restore the integrity of child nutrition programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CUBIN (for herself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 4010. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COX, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4011. A bill to promote human rights and freedom in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 to permanently authorize the public school and private school tuition assistance programs established under the Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the approval of any drug that infringes the right to life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4014. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Brian Lamb; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 4015. A bill to expand the applicability of daylight saving time; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the education and training of allied health professionals in exchange for a service commitment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4017. A bill to assure that development of certain Federal oil and gas resources will occur in ways that protect water resources and respect the rights of the surface owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CASE:

H.R. 4018. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to assure that immigrants do not have to wait longer for an immigrant visa as a result of a reclassification from family second preference to family first preference because of the naturalization of a parent or spouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. FORD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BACA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REYES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. CARDIN):

H. Con. Res. 394. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Citizens Bank, the Nation's oldest continuously operating minority-owned bank, and honoring the many contributions of the Nation's minority-owned banks; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Con. Res. 395. Concurrent resolution honoring Donald J. Smith for his commitment to providing housing and economic assistance opportunities to Los Angeles-area low-income families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H. Res. 572. A resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the appointment of individuals to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 348: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 375: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 601: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GUITERREZ, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms.

ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STARK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 677: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 742: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 814: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 872: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 970: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 979: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1117: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1173: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1193: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1264: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1336: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1348: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1357: Mr. HOFFFEL.
H.R. 1508: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1519: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1662: Mr. BONNER and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1726: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2023: Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 2068: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2096: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2133: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2151: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2157: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 2238: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 2426: Ms. MAJETTE.
H.R. 2434: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2464: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2490: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2511: Mr. HOFFFEL and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2569: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 2574: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2612: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2671: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2771: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 2814: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2824: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 2863: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2915: Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 2928: Mr. GERLACH and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2978: Mr. HALL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 3049: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3085: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3104: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 3178: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3194: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H.R. 3246: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. McINNIS, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 3308: Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 3359: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 3371: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3377: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3378: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3403: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 3416: Mr. OLVER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 3436: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 3441: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GORDON, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3452: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 3474: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3543: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 3545: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 3664: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 3673: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3676: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3716: Mr. SPRATT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3755: Mr. PASTOR and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3789: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3793: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3804: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3811: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 3816: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3824: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3873: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. BIGBERT, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3888: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 3889: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 3913: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 3926: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3951: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3968: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3970: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 3980: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 3984: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3985: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3986: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3993: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 3995: Mr. FORD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3999: Mr. DINGELL.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.J. Res. 72: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RENZI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. FARR and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 213: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.
H. Con. Res. 276: Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 314: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MAJETTE, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 330: Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 366: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr.

PALLONE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BAIRD.

H. Con. Res. 369: Ms. LEE and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WOLF, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. TANNER.

H. Res. 307: Mr. INSLEE.

H. Res. 550: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 558: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. EHLERS.

H. Res. 565: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 567: Mr. FERGUSON and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 393

OFFERED BY: Mr. EMANUEL

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING A TRIGGER MECHANISM FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICE NEGOTIATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The cost of the new Medicare law, estimated by the Congressional Budget Office before its passage to be \$395,000,000,000 over ten years, has now been estimated by the Department of Health and Human Services to be \$534,000,000,000 over ten years. Without taking steps to control the cost of prescription drugs, the Medicare law will become an unsustainable burden on the the Government and on taxpayers. In addition, rising drug costs could end up shifting additional cost burdens to Medicare beneficiaries.

(2) Prescription drug costs increased 15.3 percent in 2003. These rising costs are one of the primary drivers of increasing health care costs, which ran at 9.3 percent last year.

(3) The Veterans' Administration as well as every private insurer depends on bulk negotiation to keep drug prices down.

(4) According to a study by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, Medicare payments for 24 leading drugs in 2000 were \$887,000,000 higher than actual wholesale prices available to physicians and suppliers and \$1,9,000,000,000 higher than prices available through the Federal supply schedule used by the Department of Veterans Affairs and other Federal purchasers.

(5) Despite the fact that the private prescription drug plans provided for in the Medicare law have the right to negotiate with manufacturers, former CMS Administrator Tom Scully said that the type of private plans created by the Medicare law "doesn't exist in nature". Therefore, it is impossible to predict whether these private plans will in fact be able to acquire substantial discounts through negotiation. In addition, private plans cannot take advantage of the full purchasing power of 40,000,000 beneficiaries.

(6) Secretary Tommy Thompson said that he does not necessarily agree with the Administration's rationale for not allowing him

to negotiate, and that if he were given the power to negotiate, he would use it.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) legislation should be adopted which would establish a trigger mechanism for negotiation of prescription drug prices by the Secretary of Health and Human Services; and

(2) this legislation would mandate that at any point when the expected ten-year expenditures for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for Public Law 108-173 exceed the Congressional Budget Office estimate for this legislation, the Secretary of Health and Human Services would be required to immediately enter into direct negotiations with pharma-

ceutical manufacturers for competitive drug prices.

H. CON. RES. 393

OFFERED BY: MR. EMANUEL

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Paragraph (1)(A) of section 101 (the recommended levels of Federal revenues) is amended by increasing revenues for the fiscal years set forth below as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$875,000,000.

Paragraph (1)(B) of section 101 (the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced) is amended by reducing the reduction for the fiscal years set forth below as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$875,000,000.

Paragraph (2) of section 101 (the appropriate levels of new budget authority) is amended by increasing new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 by \$1,750,000,000.

Paragraph (3) of section 101 (the appropriate levels of total budget outlays) is amended by increasing total budget outlays for fiscal year 2006 by \$1,750,000,000.

Paragraph (4) of section 101 (deficits (on-budget) is amended by decreasing the deficit for fiscal year 2005 by \$875,000,000 and by increasing the deficit for fiscal year 2006 by \$875,000,000.

Paragraph (11) of section 102 (Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500)) is amended by increasing new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2006 by \$1,750,000,000.