

this town, has said it is not sustainable. When will this administration wake up?

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, let me talk about something good for America. Community health centers offer primary and preventive health care services to everyone, including low-income, underinsured and uninsured families. While low-income individuals have access to Medicaid and the elderly and the disabled have access to Medicare, uninsured and underinsured families often delay seeing a doctor or turn to emergency departments where treatment is several times more expensive.

Community health centers, however, provide comprehensive and preventive care that adjusts charges for patient care according to family income. The Federal Government spends over \$23 billion a year to offset losses incurred by hospitals for patients unable to pay their bills, and the Department of Health and Human Services tell us that medical care at community health centers cost only about \$1.30 per pay per patient served. In fact, medical care at community health centers is around \$250 less than the average annual expenditure for an office-based medical provider.

In short, community health centers offer an affordable source of quality health care, but the problem is we need more of them. The President has proposed a \$304 million increase for community health center programs to create 1,200 new or expanded sites to serve an additional 6.1 million people by next year. In order to meet that goal, the centers must double their workforce by adding double the clinicians by 2006. Hiring that many doctors would be costly, but encouraging more to volunteer would help to meet this need. While many physicians are willing to volunteer their services at these centers, they often hesitate due to the high cost of medical liability insurance. As a result, there are too few volunteer physicians to meet our health care needs.

By comparison, volunteer physicians at free health clinics and paid physicians at community health centers already receive comprehensive medical liability coverage under the Federal Tort Claims Act, or FTCA.

Accordingly, I am introducing the Community Health Center Volunteer Physician Protection Act of 2005 to extend the medical liability protections of FTCA to volunteer physicians at community health centers. These protections are necessary to ensure that the centers can continue to play an im-

portant role in lowering our Nation's health care costs and meeting the needs for affordable and access quality health care. The Community Health Center Volunteer Physician Protection Act of 2005 is supported by the National Association of Community Health Centers, the American Medical Association and the American Osteopathic Association. I would encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation to ensure access to health care for those who need it most.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 415

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415, and my name be added to H.R. 414.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's name will be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The primary sponsor of H.R. 414 will have to add the gentleman's name as a cosponsor.

□ 1645

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND FUNDING PRIORITIES

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, between the \$81 billion supplemental appropriations bill passed by the House yesterday and the outrageous budget resolution that came on the floor today, the Bush administration's funding priorities are dangerous, dishonorable, and downright hazardous to the safety of our Nation. The \$81 billion supplemental and the fiscal year 2006 budget will do little more than continue the President's arrogant foreign policies, particularly his shameful misadventures in Iraq which have made Americans much less safe over the past 2 years by creating a new generation of terrorists whose common tie is their hatred of the United States.

The supplemental appropriations bill that passed the House yesterday underscores the lack of planning and arrogance that have characterized this war. \$200 billion will have been appropriated for Iraq after this latest bill clears through the Senate. That is about \$675 for every man, woman, and child.

The most disturbing thing about the President's request for more Iraq funding is the lack of accountability. Why did Congress approve another check for a mission that has been so badly botched? Who is being held accountable for the misuse of the \$150 billion we appropriated over the last 2 years? By once again funding the war in Iraq through a supplemental spending bill, the Bush administration is continuing to pull a fast one on the American people. Instead of spending billions to build permanent bases in Iraq, our funds should go towards the National Guard and Reserve forces who have left their families and their homes to serve their country and who have been abandoned as sitting ducks in Iraq.

Despite the President's solemn promise to fight terrorism, the Bush administration has overwhelmingly concentrated the country's resources on developing bigger and more expensive weapons at the expense of other more suitable security tools which will truly keep Americans safe. Even Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has stated that there is \$22 billion of waste in the Pentagon's budget every year.

The fiscal year 2006 budget that passed the House today is just the latest example of questionable Republican spending priorities. This budget wastes billions of dollars in outdated Cold War-era weapons systems that fail to address America's true security needs. We do not need millions of dollars for the outdated F-22 fighter jet which the military no longer relies on during combat. We do not need millions of dollars for a new generation of nuclear weapons, the so-called "bunker buster bomb," and we certainly do not need another \$8 billion for a missile defense system that has never been proven to work.

The proper response to the supposed threat of a missile attack from North Korea is not to build a multibillion-dollar missile defense system. We should be addressing this situation through aggressive diplomacy and country-to-country talks. Certainly the nonmilitary approach will not cost the United States taxpayers \$8 billion a year, and ultimately the non-\$8 billion approach will keep America safer. In fact, if the Bush administration spent even 1 percent of the time on diplomacy that it does on trying to develop a missile defense shield, we would probably be on good terms with Iran and North Korea by now.

We need a new approach to security that places a greater emphasis on non-military security. Only by shifting our spending priorities accordingly will we be able to address today's true security challenges. That is why I have developed a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART is a Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART security will ensure that our spending priorities match the security threats that we face.

Madam Speaker, this Congress needs to stop signing blank checks to a fiscally reckless administration. If we are going to spend billions and billions of dollars, let us at least spend it on the people who deserve it, the brave troops in the field who have sacrificed so much for their country. Let us spend it on our Nation's veterans, like 24-year-old Tim Goodrich who came to my office yesterday and shared stories about his service in Afghanistan. One of Tim's friends was supposed to come with him, but he was so troubled by his experience in Iraq that he was not able to make it to our meeting because he has trouble sleeping at night.

Let us spend it on the 32-year-old naval officer who was in my office who had no prior experience in rebuilding war-torn regions before he was put in charge of the reconstruction of an entire city in Iraq.

This officer told me he couldn't in good conscience recruit Iraqis to work on his projects, because he knew their lives would be in danger if they worked with the American military.

It's time we honor the commitment of young veterans like Tim and others by providing them the resources they need and deserve, and by promising not to send our military in harm's way unless the very security of our nation depends on it. It's time to refocus our fiscal priorities on the true security needs of the American people.

IN DEFENSE OF CHAIRMAN GREENSPAN

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to bring up a subject that is of great concern to me and that is the tarnishing of a gentleman's reputation in this town and that is Alan Greenspan, the head of the Federal Reserve. I do not always agree with Alan Greenspan; but over the last couple of days, he has been called a political hack, he has been called a lot of things, and I think it is important to come to the floor to defend somebody's credibility in this town that has been largely responsible for the tranquil waters we find ourselves in on the financial markets.

Alan Greenspan has been reappointed by Republican and Democratic Presidents because of his ability to manage our national economy, his ability to see through problems that have cropped up around the world, his ability to intervene at times when it has saved the countries that we have assisted; and now because he has disagreed, or at least ventured an opinion on private accounts relative to Social Security, he has now come under scrutiny, ridicule, and been called things like political hack. Senator REID made these comments on TV recently. Senator CLINTON made the comments re-

cently. Senator CLINTON, I would remind her that her husband reappointed Alan Greenspan to this post.

I think it is important to note that how dare anybody disagree with the other side of the aisle and if they do so, they will find themselves subjected to the kind of terminology like political hacks. It takes me back to the Medicare debate that we had in this Congress when AARP decided to embrace the Republican plan. Up until that day, the other side of the aisle described the AARP as the gold standard of organizations out protecting the welfare of seniors in America. The day they chose to embrace a plan offered by President Bush, they became the scoundrels, the leadership of their party went down and picketed at their front door and declared that the AARP was an enemy of senior citizens.

What a difference a year makes. Now that they are opposing any plans even to consider personal accounts, they are back in the good graces and AARP once again is fighting for people. What is desperate about this attack is that Alan Greenspan has presided over the economy in an extraordinary fashion. It is interesting that when Mr. Greenspan speaks, the world listens. The Wall Street market-makers listen. Political leaders around the world listen. His words are carried across every wire story in the world because of the impact his words have on the economies of our Nation and our allies. He is not viewed as a political hack by those allies. He is viewed as a sage, stable, steady hand on the controls and levers of the American economy.

As I said earlier, I do not agree with Mr. Greenspan on all issues. I think sometimes we raise rates too slowly or raise them too quickly and then ultimately do not lower them enough to get the kind of economic recovery that we had hoped through rate adjustment. That being said, though, I hardly would describe a man that is lauded by virtually every facet of the American economy as a political hack or somebody whose time has come for them to leave.

So I just make the point that I do not mind debating the intricacies of Social Security; I do not mind having a debate representing the fifth largest Medicare-eligible population in America, the various opinions on whether you raise caps, change age of retirement, consider for a moment personal accounts just as a conversation point; it does not have to necessarily end up in law, but let us at least talk about it to see if it fixes Social Security. But it does trouble me that somebody of Mr. Greenspan's credibility, somebody of his reputation, somebody who has certainly served this Nation in a wonderful way would be pilloried by a political party simply because he chose to talk about how we may solve the woes of Social Security in the future.

I commend him for his work. I salute him for his brilliance on handling America's markets. I ask the other side of the aisle to reflect back on the history of his service to this country as the Federal Reserve chairman. I ask them to look at the collapsing of some economies in Asia during his tenure when he sought and was able to rescue those economies from fiscal collapse. It is often said if the United States gets a cold, the rest of the world gets the flu. The same could happen if you allowed the economies of these nations to collapse without our intervention.

I salute Mr. Greenspan, and I do ask that my colleagues refrain from making him the object of their political ire. Let us debate the merits and the wisdom of our direction, but let us not ruin somebody's personal and business career simply to get even for their statements or their opinions.

AMERICA'S INCREASING DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, if Mr. Greenspan had been doing such a good job, the value of the dollar would not be declining every single week. Let me just say that the budget that just passed here is a national disgrace. It only passed by a couple of votes. If two people had changed, we might have gotten a real budget resolution on this floor, just by the narrowest of margins.

Last week, the U.S. Commerce Department announced the largest one-month budget deficit in U.S. history. Somebody better pay attention. Mr. Greenspan ought to pay attention. In fact, now we have the second largest trade deficit in history. The ships are lined up outside L.A. harbor as far as you can see out into the Pacific and they go back empty. What is wrong with these accounts?

Gas prices, by the way, are up 19 percent. The value of the dollar has declined by more than 33 percent, more than a third against the Euro in the past 3 years, and our economy is sputtering. The demand for oil is just about to increase with summer and vacations on the way. No wonder the stock market fell more than 100 points last week, based on investors' fears about, you guessed it, rising oil prices.

The February budget deficit of \$114 billion was the first time the deficit for any one month exceeded \$100 billion. Every day America goes more in hock to foreign lenders. They are the ones that are propping us up. In fact, if you just look between a year ago, October 2003 and November 2004, you can see who we are in hock to. Japan holds most of the paper, over \$714 billion now. Next comes Europe, over \$380 billion. China, Hong Kong, but they are