ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 13, 2003, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 14, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 15, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2002, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, May 15, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 20

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 20.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 note), I hereby appoint Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York and Representative JESSE JACKSON, Jr. of Illinois, to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission for the 108th Congress.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

□ 1445

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). 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.

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

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

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

There was no objection.

THE EFFECTS OF PASSING H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH TAX ACT OF 2003

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, today we passed a bill out of here in an hour that spent $550 billion worth of taxes. The fact that the House of Representatives, which is the body charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of originating all tax policy in this country, that we can deal with a bill of that size with 1 hour's debate is an absolute travesty. The Founders of this country never considered that a bill of that magnitude with those kinds of long-range effects would be considered on the back of galloping horses as we run to the airport to catch planes all over the country.

The theory of this bill is that if we give back taxes, somehow we will give it to people who will then invest it, creating jobs that will lead to employment in this country. We will hear over and over and over again we are going to create a million jobs, and all this kind of stuff. But the fact is that the Department of Commerce says that today our industries in this country are operating at 75 percent capacity. That means that they can make 25 percent more of whatever it is they make whether it is shirts or tables or furniture or automobiles. They have already the capacity to produce more goods.

What is not happening is that there are people there who have money to purchase those things. So the concept that we are going to give more to the people running the factory and that some factory owner is so stupid that he has already put out all of whatever he can make and thinks he can sell that he would now make more, he would get more machinery and open up a new building and make more automobiles or more whatever, it simply does not pass the commonsense test. If someone runs a bakery and they make 10 loaves of bread and their ovens will allow them to make 20 loaves of bread, but they only sell seven loaves of bread, why would they make 20 loaves of bread? Why would they hire another baker, buy more flour and more yeast and make more bread? So this theory that suddenly if we give more money to the people at the top will magically create jobs is absolutely nonsense. What is needed, obviously, is for the people at the bottom who buy things to have more money.

The bill we just passed out of here in an hour gave 80 percent of the benefit to people making more than $75,000 a year. Now, $75,000 a year is a pretty good income. One can do quite a bit with $75,000 a year. But do all the people above it need more? Do they need to take 80 percent of the benefit and 20 percent goes to the people below? If one is a millionaire under that bill, they will get $105,000 tax refund, $105,000. What will these people on the bottom get? $325.

Most people buy what they can afford, and if they have a small income, they sometimes cannot afford things so they do not buy them. When they have got a big income, they can do whatever they want. But this bill says these people over here with all the money, we are going to give them more, and these people over here, we are going to give them $325.

There are many ways we could have written this bill. I had a proposal to give a payroll tax holiday. There were other proposals that were out here. But the point is that we needed a bill that was fair, that gave the money to the people at the bottom. I was prepared to give a $1,400 amount to everybody in

the whole society because everybody pays the payroll tax. Everybody pays Social Security. Everybody pays Medicare, and if we gave that back to people on the first $20,000 of their income, the people on the bottom would get about $1,500 in refund. They could spend it to buy an extra shirt, to take their family to dinner, to do many of the things that would keep the small businesses open that are now closing because nobody can come and buy dinner for their family. They have to stay at home and live within a tight budget. But the leadership of this House for some reason did not want us to deal with that. They would not let us deal with unemployment. None of the people at the bottom got anything. That is a sad day for this House.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

There was no objection.

TAX CUTS AND VETERANS BENEFITS

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have just voted on a large tax cut bill in this House, but I think it is important for the American people to understand how our fiscal irresponsibility is affecting other aspects of our society. I think it is important for the American people to know that the budget the President sent to this House originally and which was passed by this Chamber cut mandatory and discretionary spending for veterans programs by $28.3 billion. It is hard to believe that at a time when our President was asking America's young men and women to go to Iraq and to fight and in many cases give their lives that he sent a budget to this House that cut veterans benefits by $28.3 billion.

Let me tell my colleagues what else was in that budget that the President sent over that hurts our Nation's veterans. He was asking that the co-payment for a prescription drug that a veteran would need to pay would go from $7 a prescription up to $15 a prescription. Just about a year and a half ago, we increased that co-payment, or the House did against my objection and the objection of my Democratic colleagues, they increased that co-payment for a prescription drug from $2 up to $7 and now the President is asking that that co-payment be increased from $7 to $15 a prescription? And do my colleagues not understand that many veterans get 10 or more prescriptions a month? That is 10 times 15. That is a lot of money for veterans who may be living on very limited fixed incomes. It is shameful. It is shameful what the President has asked in his budget that he sent to the House.

But it gets even worse. The President has suggested that there be an annual enrollment fee imposed upon veterans of $250 annually. Think about that. These are young Americans who have gone and served our country, many of them during wartime. They have served honorably; they have come back to this country. They are participating in the VA healthcare system, and the President says they should be charged an annual enrollment fee of $250 at the very time that we are giving huge, huge tax cuts to the richest people in this country, many of them who have never served in the military. It is just outrageous. But it gets worse because in the President's budget he suggested that the cost for clinic visit be increased.

At the time when we are giving large tax cuts to the wealthiest in our country, many of whom have never served in our military, we are putting additional financial burdens on the backs of our Nation's veterans. And then about 1 year ago, this administration's Department of Veterans Affairs put out a gag order, and basically the gag order said this: too many veterans are coming in for services. We do not have enough money to provide those services; so none of our health care providers around the country can any longer make public service announcements encouraging veterans to use the benefits that they are entitled to receive. No longer can our health care professionals participate in health fairs which could identify diseases in their early stages so that they could be prevented. No longer are our health care professionals around the country allowed to put out newsletters describing the services that veterans are legally entitled to and encouraging them to take advantage of those services.

Mr. Speaker, we are limiting what we are willing to do for our veterans so that we can give huge tax breaks to the richest people in this country. And the question is this: The President and leadership of this House must make a choice. Are we going to defend and protect and provide for our veterans, or are we going to continue to cut their benefits, to cut services to veterans in order to give money to the richest people in this country? That is a choice that is facing those of us who serve in this House.

MOTHER'S DAY

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate all the mothers in America. During the last few weeks, we have watched as our Armed Forces fought and won a war in Iraq. This weekend many of those troops will celebrate Mother's Day at home with their families, and in fact, some of those returning troops are mothers themselves.

Earlier this year while those mothers and daughters and fathers and sons bravely fought for the freedom of the people of Iraq and for the security of America, the House passed a bill to relieve some of the tax burden on our troops. Today we gave all American mothers tax relief. This is more than a bouquet of flowers. It is more than a sentimental greeting card. Tax relief for working mothers and their children may correspond with Mother's Day, but it produces dividends well beyond this Sunday.

This plan gives the economy an immediate shot in the arm by accelerating tax relief for the marriage penalty, increasing the child tax credit, and providing working mothers with more of their hard-earned dollars through an accelerated tax relief program. And just think, these mothers can use their recouped income for their needs, for the needs of their children, for the needs of their family.

Furthermore, with sizable long-term tax relief on capital, businesses will receive the investment incentives that will help create more jobs. Just think, because of the legislation this House passed today, more mothers who are without a job will find one. More mothers who own small businesses will be able to expand that business instead of closing their doors. More mothers will provide their children with a better life. On this Mother's Day, this House can tell mothers of America that we have not given them flowers, we have given them the flower shop.

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

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

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the Democratic 5 minutes after the Republican.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have to object because he has had three in a row, and it is going back and forth, and if it stays in regular order, then it is alternating.