

Every time the oil cartels raise the price about two bucks a barrel, well, they take that plus another 10 percent for profit. So the higher the price, the bigger their profit.

If you look at the quarterly statements of the largest oil companies in the world, ExxonMobil and others, they are awash in tens of billions of dollars of cash extracted 10, 20, 30 cents at a time in excess profits from the American people at the pump.

Now, this is hurting real people. But this administration says they are powerless. This Republican Congress says they are powerless. They cannot take on the OPEC cartel. They cannot take on the price-gouging oil industry. They pass so-called energy legislation that says maybe 10, 12, 15 years from now, if there is any oil in ANWR, and if we can pump it, and if they do not take too big of a markup or price gouge on that, it will provide some price relief. That is their answer.

Today, in this bill there was nothing. They could not even adopt the minimalist study of what the OPEC cartel is doing to the American people. That was not allowed by the Republican majority. And they certainly could not allow the amendment that would stop the United States Government from buying from the oil companies at this extortionate price and pumping that oil into the ground for a future crisis.

This is a crisis now, today, for working American men and women, people who have to commute to work in my district by car. Small businesses across this country and big businesses and the airlines are going broke. But this administration says they are powerless, they can do nothing.

Well, guess what? The United States of America can do better, but we just have to get rid of the oil cartel. Not the OPEC oil cartel, but the oil cartel running the United States Congress and the White House and the Vice President's office.

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

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

□ 2145

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to assume the Special Order time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

There was no objection.

U.S. SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Hamid Karzai, the President of Afghanistan, criticized the U.S. in a graduation speech in Boston on Sunday. He said the U.S. had "the power and hence the responsibility" to get involved in Afghanistan even before the tragic events we refer to as 9/11. President Karzai said because the U.S. did not get involved sooner, the result was "horrible suffering for the Afghan people."

This is a man who was given a hero's welcome at the White House, the State and Defense Departments, and the World Bank just yesterday. This is a man who was a special guest at two joint sessions of Congress. This is a man who probably would not be president today if not for the U.S., and to whom our taxpayers have given billions of dollars since September of 2001.

It takes a lot of gall for President Karzai to come to the U.S. and blame us for the horrible suffering of the Afghan people because we did not get involved in Afghanistan in a big way before 2001.

Since 2001, U.S. taxpayers have sent billions to Afghanistan for economic, humanitarian, and reconstruction assistance. We have sent several hundreds of millions of dollars each year, in addition to what the military is spending, and most of what the military is doing in Iraq and Afghanistan is pure foreign aid. No country in the history of the world has even come close to doing as much for other countries as has the United States. No country in the history of the world has even come close to doing as much for Afghanistan as has the United States. Yet President Karzai comes here and makes a major speech and instead of thanking the American people over and over, as he should have, he criticizes us for not getting involved sooner.

Just yesterday, the front page of The Washington Post carried a story about the parents of Pat Tillman who was killed by friendly fire in Afghanistan. The parents bitterly attacked the Army for lying and covering up the details of their son's death, and they have every right to do so. Pat Tillman's dad said, "They blew up their poster boy" and then lied about it to create a "patriotic fervor" in the U.S.

I voted to go to war in Afghanistan because I and everyone but one in Congress felt we had to respond to 9/11, but we should have gotten out of there after 3 or 4 months; and if we had, Pat Tillman would still be alive today.

I voted against going to war in Iraq because, among many other reasons, Saddam Hussein's total military budget was only a little over two-tenths of 1 percent of ours, and he was no threat to us whatsoever. It is no criticism of the military to say this was a totally unnecessary war.

Unless conservatives now believe in massive foreign aid, huge deficit spending, world government and placing almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our taxpayers and our military, all things that conservatives have opposed in the past, then conservatives should want us to get out of both Iraq and Afghanistan.

William F. Buckley, Jr., the godfather of conservatism, wrote a column a few days ago saying it is now time to exit Iraq. Many leaders of our military will want us to stay in Iraq and Afghanistan for many years so they can get higher and higher appropriations. But in a few months, our national debt will reach \$9 trillion. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have spent over \$300 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan and probably another \$100 billion in the coming fiscal year which starts October 1.

Mr. Speaker, seven more Americans were killed in Iraq yesterday. Our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), just told me that four guardsmen from his State were killed today. Already this month has been one of the bloodiest of the entire war. The headlines on the front page of the Washington Times says: "Car bombings kill scores across Iraq."

Our Founding Fathers did not intend for us to run Iraq or Afghanistan or any other country. Our first obligation should be to the American people and no one else. We should be friends to other countries, but we cannot afford to continue spending hundreds of billions all over the world.

In just a few years we will not be able to pay our own people all the Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, drug costs, military and civil service and private pensions that we have promised. To stay any longer in Iraq or Afghanistan goes against every traditional conservative position. We can no longer afford it in either blood or treasury.

PASS H.R. 2560, THE ELAINE SULLIVAN ACT

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation, H.R. 2560, that is specifically designed to save lives and reduce suffering. It is a small, but significant, measure to protect the voiceless and the vulnerable.

In an instant, a wrong turn, a sudden fall, a missed step, someone, indeed anyone, can find himself or herself in a crisis and in need of emergency medical care.

In California alone, nearly 10 million people require emergency room care every year. And of those, 1.5 million arrive in critical condition. In fact, nationwide, nearly 1 million people arrive in emergency rooms each year unconscious or physically unable to give informed consent to their care.

What happens or what fails to happen in the critical, precious, and immediate moments after the single split second of an emergency can be the difference between healing and heart-break, between calamity and recovery, between life and death.

Consider the story of Elaine Sullivan. A very active 71-year-old woman, Elaine fell at home while getting into her bathtub. When paramedics arrived, they realized that injuries to her mouth and head had made her unable to communicate, or as the hospital later discovered, to give informed consent for her own care.

Although stable for the first few days, she began to slip into critical condition. Despite having her daughter's contact information clearly indicated on her chart, the hospital failed to notify her family for 6 days. Tragically, just hours later, Elaine Sullivan died alone in the hospital.

In the aftermath of this tragedy, Elaine Sullivan's daughter, Jan, and granddaughter, Laura, turned their personal pain to public action. Jan and Laura Greenwald went to work to make sure that what happened to their loved one would not happen to others.

From their research, the Greenwalds learned about other incidents like their own, in which families of hospitalized patients were not notified at all or notified after lengthy delay. Although uncommon, these stories were alarming; but, alas, they were avoidable.

Let me be clear. Most hospitals notify the next of kin of unconscious emergency room arrivals relatively quickly. However, emergency rooms are extremely high pressure, intense, and sometimes chaotic environments. According to statistics compiled by the American College of Emergency Physicians, more than 88 percent of emergency room doctors surveyed reported moderate to severe overcrowding in their department. In the hustle and bustle of the ER, despite the professionalism and dedication of staff, there are real risks that a simple phone call may not be able to be made in a timely fashion.

In the case of Elaine Sullivan, the phone call was not made. In her memory and honor, I have introduced this bill so that in the future phone calls to loved ones will always be made. The bill, the Elaine Sullivan Act, is sensible. It requires hospitals that receive Medicare funding to make reasonable efforts to contact a family member, specified health care agent, or surrogate decision-maker of incapacitated patients within 24 hours of arrival at the emergency department.

The bill is realistic. Modeled after State laws in Illinois and California, the bill recognizes that such notifications would be difficult and even impractical in certain instances and under certain circumstances. Therefore, the 24-hour notification requirement does not apply when hospitals implement a disaster or mass casualty program or during a declared state of

emergency or other local mass casualty situation.

The bill is constructive. The legislation makes Federal grants available for the next 5 years to qualified not-for-profit organizations to establish and operate a national next of kin registry. As a high-speed, electronic free search service, the voluntary registry would help hospitals and government agencies to locate family members of the injured, missing, and the deceased.

How would the registry work? Consider for a moment just one distressing, but relevant, scenario. Your loved one, say your spouse, is on a business trip. She is out of state and on her own. On the way, she is involved in a serious head-on collision. Unconscious and unable to communicate, she is rushed to the nearest hospital. Unbeknownst to you, your wife lay comatose, fighting for her life, miles from home.

Doctors and nurses work feverishly to provide emergency medical care to a patient who is only a name on the license; but to you, she is the love of your life. If the two of you had signed up for the next of kin registry, the hospital staff would be able to quickly notify you about your wife's critical condition. You could rush to be by her side, share critical medical history and information that could help save her life; hence, the bill is necessary.

It is not intended to frustrate the mission of hospitals, but rather to facilitate it. It is about notifying the right people at the right time in order to share the right information during an emergency. Using this crucial medical information while caring for a critically ill patient reduces the hospital's own liability. So, such notification is vital.

Not only is it important to have a family member present to comfort the patient, but also to make informed decisions that the patient can't make for him or herself and to provide the medical history that could very well be the difference between life and death.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 2560—the Elaine Sullivan Act. It is a small but sensible measure designed to save lives and ease suffering. Mr. Speaker, we don't know when tragedy will strike. But, if it does, we should know that we would not be alone. This bill provides the assurance that our loved ones will be by our side.

SMART SECURITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the first Presidential debate of the 2004 Presidential election, moderator Jim Lehrer asked the candidates what they believe is the single most serious threat to the national security of the United States. Without delay, Senator KERRY responded "nuclear proliferation." When President Bush had the opportunity to respond, he agreed that

nuclear nonproliferation is the biggest threat we face as a Nation.

If the President agrees that nuclear nonproliferation is such a grave and immediate threat, why does he and why does his administration continue to seek the creation of new nuclear weapons? Why does the President continue to seek funds to study the creation of the robust nuclear Earth penetrator, otherwise known as the "bunker buster" bomb? Why does this year's defense authorization bill continue this ridiculous trend by recommending a Department of Defense study about the possibility of creating the bunker buster?

Mr. Speaker, the stated purpose of the bunker buster is to destroy caves and difficult-to-reach terrorist hideouts, but the bunker buster is completely unnecessary. The United States military already is capable of bombing these remote locations, and they do not need to use nuclear weapons.

The bunker buster is also extremely dangerous. A detonation of this deadly weapon would create an enormous, uncontrollable explosion, spreading toxic, radioactive materials over a large area; and an explosion could cause the death of thousands of innocent civilians and devastate large tracts of lands.

How many times must we consider the merits or lack thereof of the bunker buster bomb? How many times must sensible nonproliferation priorities compete with a dangerous nuclear arms race?

To address the true security threats we face, I have introduced the SMART Security resolution, H. Con. Res. 158, with the support of 49 of my House colleagues. SMART is a Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. It encourages renewed nonproliferation efforts over continued nuclear buildup.

SMART urges sufficient funding and support for nonproliferation efforts in countries that possess nuclear weapons and nuclear materials. One of the best ways to accomplish this goal is through CTR, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. The Cooperative Threat Reduction program successfully works with Russia to dismantle and safeguard excess nuclear weapons and materials in the states of the former Soviet Union.

Under this program, more than 20,000 Russian scientists, formerly tasked with creating nuclear weapons, are now working to dismantle them. That is why SMART Security includes robust support for the current CTR model, including expanding the program to other nations such as Libya and Pakistan, nations that possess excess nuclear weapons and excess nuclear materials.

To promote these efforts, earlier today I introduced an amendment to the Defense authorization bill to expand CTR. My amendment would bring this important program to Libya and Pakistan, two countries that are known to possess nuclear materials.