



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **108<sup>th</sup>** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 6, 2003

No. 66

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 6, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN 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 7, 2003, 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for 5 minutes.

### REJECT REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I did not think it was possible, but chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) came up with a worse tax plan than the one that President Bush proposed earlier this year. Neither the President's plan nor the House Republican plan, scheduled to be marked by the Committee on Ways and Means today, will jump-start the economy.

Mr. Speaker, since the President took office, more than 2.7 million pri-

vate sector jobs have been lost, the worst record in 40 years. Any tax cut passed by Congress should be fair, fast-acting and fiscally responsible. The Republican plan fails this test.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax plan is simply unfair. The wealthiest Americans will fare better under the Republican tax plan than the President's plan, while middle class Americans, Americans with annual incomes between \$30,000 and \$100,000, will actually receive less under the Republican plan than they would have under the President's plan. According to a report released this week by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, households with incomes of more than \$1 million per year would receive an average tax cut this year of \$105,600 under the House Republican plan, and that is \$15,000 more than they would have received under the President's proposal.

Contrast those benefits with the middle fifth of households that will receive an average tax cut of \$218 under the Thomas plan, slightly less than under the Bush plan. And let me reiterate, a millionaire under the Republican plan would see a tax benefit of more than \$105,000, and an American making between \$40,000 and \$50,000 would receive a cut of only \$456.

At a time when we should be doing everything possible to jump-start the economy, the Republican solution centers around tax cuts on dividends and capital gains, two cuts that are targeted towards the wealthiest Americans, and according to economists will not create any new jobs. Do not just take my word for it, consider that more than 400 economists earlier this year said, "The tax cut plan proposed by President Bush is not the answer to the problem." The economists concluded that the permanent dividend tax cut in particular is not credible as a short-term stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, like the Bush economic blueprint, the House GOP plan is fis-

cally irresponsible, saddling our children with debt and hurting long-term economic growth. What a reversal of fortune we have witnessed over the last 2 years. When the Bush administration came into office, there was a projected \$5.6 trillion 10-year surplus. With this tax package, coupled with the huge tax cut in 2001, Republicans will produce a record \$1.4 trillion deficit over the next 10 years. That is a \$7 trillion reversal in our country's fortunes.

Today, based on the tax proposal this House will debate later this week, it is clear the House Republicans have changed their tune. No longer are skyrocketing deficits a concern, this despite the fact that Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan last week agreed that huge deficits will threaten economic growth. He stated, "If through tax cuts you get significant increases in deficits which induce a rise in long-term interest rates, you will significantly undercut the benefits that would be achieved from any tax cut."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax plan is full of gimmicks designed to hide the true cost to taxpayers. In fact, the only proposals within the Republican plan which are beneficial to America's middle class; that is, the Marriage Penalty Relief and the Child Tax Credit, would expire after 2005. Instead, Republicans would come back and probably extend the benefits which would raise the total cost of the package to at least \$760 billion through 2013. The Washington Post editorial page called these gimmicks "tax cut trickery" just this morning in their editorial.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our economy needs a true jolt to reverse American's fears of losing their jobs, the Republicans once again plan to give a huge tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. This plan offers very little to families and middle class Americans, and instead saddles them with a

□ 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.

H3643

huge deficit, a deficit that risks the future of Social Security and Medicare and means likely future interest rate increases.

Democrats have proposed a true economic stimulus plan that is fair, fast acting and fiscally responsible. Our plan would create 1 million new jobs this year, provide an extension of unemployment benefits to millions of Americans still looking for jobs, provide tax relief to small businesses to invest in new equipment this year and provide assistance to cash-strapped States and municipalities.

I do not think there is any question about the choice; but unfortunately, the Republicans have the majority and will likely be able to push their tax cut plan through the House later this week. I think it is very unfortunate because it will do nothing to reverse the economic downturn.

#### TURNING THE ECONOMIC TIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in what the previous speaker had to say. The gentleman from New Jersey just went through the President's economic and job growth package by detail, yet failed to go by detail into the Democratic alternative to creating jobs and stimulating economy because they have no alternative. The gentleman quotes the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities as if they are a think tank with credibility. That group is filled with Democratic Hill staffers and former administration people; and obviously, they are not a think tank, they are an opposition research organization, so they have no credibility in terms of what we need to stimulate our economy and grow jobs.

Mr. Speaker, too many Americans ready and willing to work are not able to find work. That is the problem. Companies are not investing or expanding, and jobs are not being created. The President's jobs and growth package which the House will take up this week will help remedy those problems. His proposal will immediately stimulate the economy to create new jobs and provide the framework for long-term economic growth. It will provide stimulative tax relief on dividends and capital gains, move the income tax rate reductions planned for 2006 up to this year, and it will eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It will increase the child tax credit, and it will accelerate business depreciation schedules.

Mr. Speaker, that is a real jobs and growth package, and it is not based on some opposition research organization, it is based on history and we understand when we cut taxes we grow the economy. All of these provisions will get jobs into the hands of people who need them, and money in the form of paychecks, not handouts, in the hands of American families.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the Committee on Ways and Means will propose a package to help create jobs for the millions of Americans out of work and help create an economic environment that rewards investment and risk. The President's plan is an American solution to an American problem.

Congress should get out of the way and let entrepreneurs and workers create jobs through investment, innovation and hard work. But for them to do that, they need real tax relief, substantial enough to do some good in our \$10 trillion economy. We do not need timid proposals or hidden tax hikes in the guise of offsets that will only reinforce current anxieties.

Mr. Speaker, after the brief session in 2001, the economic ramifications of the 9/11 attacks and the understandable anxieties during the buildup to the battle of Iraq, we have finally turned this corner toward greater economic recovery. The American people want jobs, and they deserve an economy strong enough to create those jobs.

The President's proposal will create jobs and, finally, turn the economic tide away from anxiety and into the favor of workers, small business people, homeowners, parents and retirees. I look forward to the debate and its ultimate passage.

#### THREATS TO CONSTITUTIONAL FREEDOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the previous gentlemen spoke and said that the Democrats have no plan and have no alternative. The gentleman knows that is false. The Democrats have a solid plan for economic growth, tax cuts to the middle class, not to the wealthy, targeting people who are going to spend it rather than those who are going to keep it, tax incentives for small business, which are a solid part of our plan, extending unemployment benefits and helping States with Medicaid funding. The difference is that our plan is fiscally responsible and fast acting and will prime the pump and get the economy going again.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the threats to our constitutional freedoms. On September 11, we saw two planes kill thousands of people in New York. Our country has been in two conflicts overseas since then. There is insecurity in the land. Historically at times like these, Presidents and Congresses have run rough-shod over our constitutional freedoms and taken away individual rights.

A few examples in history: When we were about to go to war with the French, the Congress passed and John Adams signed the Alien & Sedition Act

which made it illegal to talk against the government and people were thrown in jail for doing so. Abe Lincoln during the Civil War suspended the Writ of Habeas Corpus. During World War I, we again threw people in jail for speaking against the government. During World War II, we rounded up over 100,000 Japanese-American citizens and put them in internment camps. Fifty years later we realized we had done them wrong, and we apologized and paid them a meager sum. During the McCarthy era in the Cold War, 160 secret hearings were held and lives were ruined if you exercised your constitutional rights.

So in sum, war and fear and insecurity can make us lose our moorings.

After September 11, we rushed to pass the PATRIOT Act in 6 weeks. The PATRIOT Act has some good provisions which update old laws; but it also seriously undermines the Bill of Rights and many other provisions. Take one, the fourth amendment, which says there shall not be any searches of a person's home without a court issuing a warrant.

One of the worst examples of a fourth amendment violation in the PATRIOT Act is a new provision called sneak and peek. That means you can have a secret search of your house. The government can come into your house, they can search it, take things, and you may never learn. Sounds like the fourth amendment out the door.

Under the current regime President Bush can label somebody an enemy combatant, and they are thrown into a military brig even if they are an American citizen. There is no contact with the outside world, no attorney, no charges, no trial, and the person may be detained indefinitely. That does not sound like American justice to me.

□ 1245

And then just last week over in the United States Senate as the New York Times reports, we had a secret hearing in the Senate Intelligence Committee. The White House and the CIA proposed that the CIA and the military be given authority to collect intelligence on American citizens. Not even during the Cold War did we go this far. We have always kept separate the FBI, which does domestic law enforcement, and the CIA and the military, which deal with threats outside the country.

There are many more examples of our rights being eroded today. The President must be held to account for these violations. The Congress must get a grip on these abuses. The Congress should step forward, step up to the plate and review these policies and review these laws. The Congress needs to conduct real oversight in public, not behind closed doors, and needs to protect our constitutional freedoms. Ben Franklin said it best 200 years ago when he said, "If we surrender our liberty in the name of security, then we shall have neither."

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
SET TO PASS THE PRESIDENT'S  
ECONOMIC PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment as I begin my remarks and talk about an issue that is so important. I first begin by commending President Bush for his strong leadership on the economy. While so much of our Nation's attention, in fact attention around the globe, has been focused on President Bush's successful leadership as well as the successful efforts of our American men and women to liberate the oppressed people of Iraq from the brutality of Saddam Hussein, President Bush and House Republicans have been working to get this economy moving again. It is so important that we focus attention today on the economy. Today we are going to have action in the House Committee on Ways and Means to create jobs and give Americans the opportunity to go back to work.

Let me tell you why it is important to the people of Illinois. In Illinois we have 6.6 percent unemployment. Unfortunately in the district that I represent, an agricultural-industrial district in the south suburbs of Chicago, our unemployment is actually higher. Grundy County, the county that is my home county, has almost 12 percent unemployment; LaSalle has 9.8 percent unemployment; Will County has 7.9 percent unemployment; Bureau, 8.7; Kankakee, 8.5 percent. Clearly we need to get the economy moving again because it affects folks back home. The philosophy of what we are going to pursue today is following the direction the President laid out for us earlier as we work to get this economy moving again, creating jobs, giving those who are unemployed the opportunity to get a good-paying job and go back to work. Our strategy is to put extra money in the pocketbooks of workers so they can meet their families' needs and raise their take-home pay by cutting their individual taxes. We want to give business the incentive to invest in the creation of jobs.

Economists have analyzed the plan that is before us today and they project that the plan that we will be debating and passing out of the Committee on Ways and Means and hopefully out of the House this week with bipartisan support will create 1 million jobs over the next 16 months. Two-thirds of this package benefits individual taxpayers. In fact, if you pay Federal income taxes, you benefit. We double the child tax credit, from \$600 to \$1,000. That benefits 1.1 million families with children in Illinois. We eliminate effective immediately the marriage tax penalty. We make effective immediately the Bush individual rate reductions and expand the lowest tax bracket for low-in-

come Americans so more low-income Americans will have their taxes lowered in that new 10 percent tax bracket created for low-income Americans. I note that we also provide additional alternative minimum tax relief, one of the consequences of a bad policy we are still living with from the 1980s. The bottom line is two-thirds of this package benefits average taxpayers, putting extra money in the pocketbooks of workers for their families' needs.

We also jump-start the economy by providing incentives for business to invest, providing for what some people call bonus depreciation, that others like myself call accelerated depreciation, but allowing business to deduct at least 50 percent or more this year of the cost of buying a company car, an office computer, telecommunications or machine tool equipment, or if they are making their office or business more secure, investing in security and equipment, they would be able to recover the cost of that much more quickly. When you think about it, when you encourage a business to buy a company car, there is an autoworker in Chicago or the south suburbs whose job is created. We also allow companies losing money this year to go back and recover some revenue and capital from previous years so they have capital to invest in the creation of jobs.

And due to the President's leadership, we work to provide assistance and relief for those who invest for their retirement. Today, 84 million taxpayers are stockholders. That is over half of American households. Many are senior citizens who have saved for their retirement. Today they are taxed twice on their dividends from their stock holdings. That is not right. It is not fair. I realize my Democratic friends think that is okay because they want to keep the money here in Washington and they think they can spend it better than these stockholders can. The President says we should eliminate that double taxation. We make a big step with the proposal before us today by equalizing the tax treatment between capital gains and stock dividends. Those in the 10 and 15 percent bracket will only pay a 5 percent tax rate. Those in the higher brackets will pay 15. This is a good plan. It puts extra money in the pocketbooks of consumers as well as encourages businesses to invest.

I want to draw attention to one issue which I have been so involved in, which is a key part of the plan that is going to be debated and passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means today, and that is the issue of the marriage tax penalty. There are 42 million married working couples, like Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, two laborers, and, of course, their children Eduardo and Carolina. They live in Joliet, Illinois. They work hard for their living. They benefit from this plan today. When we worked 2 years ago to pass legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty because of the

rules in the other body, we had to phase it in. Today we are going to pass legislation to make marriage tax penalty relief effective this year. It is wrong to tax marriage. We benefit the Castillo family by eliminating the marriage tax penalty this year. When you think about it, that is \$1,400 they can spend in Joliet, Illinois.

ANOTHER VIEW OF THE  
PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently President Bush traveled to my home State of Ohio to sell his tax cuts. He went to a manufacturing company of I believe the largest Republican contributor in Ohio to extol the value of his tax cuts. He met with the executives of that company who will enjoy large tax cuts. He did not talk specifically about what individual workers who make 20 and 30 and 40 and \$50,000 a year will get, but understand as the President came to Ohio and talked about this tax cut, his 500-plus-billion-dollar tax cut, that half of that tax cut will go to people whose average income is \$968,000 a year. So half of that tax cut will go to people who on the average make about \$1 million a year.

The President now has shifted from talking about the tax cut because that has fallen on deaf ears, even on the ears of a Republican Senator in Ohio who has said "no" to this tax cut, thinking it throws the budget way out of balance, thinking that the tax cuts go far too much to the wealthiest citizens and not enough to middle-income Americans. The President now has shifted his talk to talk about jobs, saying that the Bush economic plan is not so much about tax cuts but is about job creation. What he does not say is since he took office, we have lost 2.6 million jobs in this country, most of them manufacturing jobs. We have lost manufacturing jobs literally every single month of the Bush presidency, something that has never happened since we have been keeping records on those kinds of things. There has been negative economic growth and negative economic job activity since the President has taken office. That has not happened in the last 50 years. At the same time the President's similar kind of tax cut which passed his first year in office is not paying the kind of benefits that he hoped. He 2 years ago asked Congress, asked the American people for a similar economic package to the one he asks for today. Yet today he is asking for it again even though we have lost 2.6 million jobs and we have lost manufacturing jobs in this country every single month since the President took office. The President wants to give tax cuts to the wealthiest citizens in this country, leaving a few hundred dollars for people making 40 or 50 or 60

or \$70,000 a year, giving 10 to \$15,000 to people making \$1 million a year.

At the same time the President wants to restrict one of the best bipartisan both job creation and poverty programs that this country has had rewarding work, and that is the earned income tax credit. The earned income tax credit was passed by a Democratic Congress with a Republican President in 1975, expanded in the eighties by a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, and now President Bush wants to restrict the earned income tax credit. People making 20, 25, \$30,000 a year under the earned income tax credit will get about \$1,000 a year more back in their taxes than they would get otherwise. It is a way to reward work. These are people that have full-time jobs, often without health care, often single parents, people that are struggling that need that kind of help. So the President wants to give huge tax cuts to people making \$1 million a year and take away much of the tax benefits under the earned income tax credit that people making 20, 25, \$30,000 a year make.

Get this, though. The IRS now has decided to change in the last 5 years, under Republican leadership in this House and Senate, to change the frequency by which they audit tax returns. If you are making \$30,000 a year and you have filed for the earned income tax credit, one out of 64 of you will be audited by the IRS. But if you make \$100,000, only one out of 120 of you will be audited by the IRS. If you are even higher income than that, then only one out of 400 of you will be audited by the IRS. So the IRS is going after people making 20, 30, 40, \$50,000 a year while allowing people by and large to skate if they are making a half million or a million dollars a year. Then on top of that the President wants to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country.

The largest newspaper in my district, the Akron Beacon Journal, had this to say about the earned income tax credit this morning: "The President wants Americans to spend their money to boost the economy. He wants to create jobs. The earned income tax credit delivers on both fronts." That is the importance of the earned income tax credit, of keeping it in place, of keeping the eligibility standards where they are, of encouraging more people to file for the earned income tax credit. That will help stimulate the economy. That goes with the general Democratic plan on economic stimulus, not simply giving tax breaks to the richest people in the country hoping that some of the money trickles down for job creation. That clearly has not worked. Instead, the Democratic plan through extending unemployment, through middle-class tax breaks, through helping small businesses, through economic stimulus of building highways and bridges and all that, that is what will put people back to work.

#### THE MOUNTING FEDERAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a couple of moments on the financial situation of the Federal Government. This chart shows what is happening to gross Federal debt. The debt held by the public, the debt held by government accounts, mostly Social Security, what we are borrowing from Social Security, added together, equal the total amount of debt. The only way debt can be increased in the United States Government is if the House and the Senate pass legislation increasing the debt limit and then the President signs it. That is what we are doing again this year and that is partially because of the increase in Federal spending.

As you can see on this chart, by 2013 we are approaching a debt of \$10 trillion; \$10 trillion debt compared to a budget for next year that is going to amount to about \$2.2 trillion. Let me tell you one of the big problems of why we are going so deep in debt. That is because of the overzealousness of this legislative body and the White House to spend more and more money.

This next chart shows the increase in spending. As you can see, the discretionary spending increases have averaged 6.3 percent each year since 1996. Since 1997, we have increased spending by 7.7 percent. Even in what is called a very frugal budget this year, with increased spending about 4.2 to 4.4 percent, still again it is about twice the rate of inflation. So if we are going to keep increasing spending, then what we are doing in effect is leaving a larger and larger debt to our kids and our grandkids.

I am a farmer from Michigan. Our goal has been on the farm to try to pay down some of that mortgage in order for our kids to have a better chance at success and the good life than maybe their parents had. Here in this body, in Congress, we keep increasing the debt on our kids. It is sort of a hidden tax. If you will a future tax increase.

Increasing taxes outright is going to increase the chance that you are not going to be reelected.

□ 1300

But increasing spending by increased borrowing means that they are cutting a ribbon on some jogging trail or some library or other pork project. It probably increases the chance that they are going to be reelected. So the propensity to spend more and more money is one of the failures of this legislative system. Simply leaving this mortgage to our kids is in effect saying that our problems today are more important than the problems that our kids and our grandkids are going to face when they are responsible for paying their taxes into this Federal Government.

Let me say that I was disappointed last week in another demonstration of

the unwillingness of this Chamber to stay within the budget. Last week we had an HIV/AIDS bill coming before the body that we passed out of the House and sent to the Senate. That bill increased by 50 percent the HIV/AIDS money that was in the budget to be spent internationally to help cure AIDS. So it was an increase of 50 percent over and above what the President suggested, 50 percent over and above what we passed in the budget resolution. So the discipline of this body to reduce spending and live within our budget leaves much to be desired.

How do we get this kind of discipline? We are talking this week about tax cuts, and certainly we cannot pay for tax cuts with increased borrowing. However, we have a system in this country where those who work hard, save and invest and try to start a business and make money producing something that other people want to buy has ended up with the kind of incentives that has made this country the strongest economically in the world. And it is not Government that decides whether we are going to have a good economy. It is the people that decide that it is going to be to their advantage and the advantage of their family if they decide to work hard and try to produce talent or some products that other people want to buy.

So the goal and the key, the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that somehow, someplace, sometime this body and the White House have got to come up with the discipline to hold down spending if we want to keep a strong economy and those incentives that cause people to expand business and therefore expand jobs.

#### THE EFFECTS OF TAX CUTS ON GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enlighten my colleagues on how the tax cuts legislation will affect my district, the Territory of Guam. Because Guam follows the mirror tax code, tax changes enacted by Congress are mirrored by the Guam tax code, and the tax cuts being contemplated by Congress this week would have a substantial effect on our island's tax revenues.

On Guam we face great challenges due to a recession that continues and a slowdown in visitors to our island. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to present the Members with the picture of the current fiscal troubles encountered by the government of Guam. The governor and the legislature are poised to enact a bill that will authorize the borrowing of in excess of \$200 million from the bond market to deal with our deficit. We learned just today that Standard and Poor's recently downgraded its

general credit rating for the government of Guam from BB to B, considering Guam's \$416 million of current outstanding debts. This places Guam's creditworthiness into a moderate to high-risk category. Thus, in addition to lacking revenues to meet the basic needs of our community, future generations will have to shoulder the burden of excessive bond deficits and high interest repayment rates.

The House Committee on Government Reform, Democratic staff, recently prepared a special report which estimates the effect of the proposed tax cuts on Guam's Treasury. The committee estimates that the proposed tax cuts would cost \$38 million for fiscal year 2003. While these funds theoretically provide Guam taxpayers with tax relief, the report demonstrates that the average tax cut for the bottom 56 percent of Guam taxpayers would be \$199. The average tax cut for the top 2 percent of taxpayers on Guam would be \$13,935. In fact, the top 2 percent in the household income category would receive a disproportionate 21 percent of the total tax cut. While there may indeed be positive benefits to these tax cuts, Mr. Speaker, the loss of \$38 million in general fund revenues, almost 10 percent of the fiscal year 2004 budget projection, is a serious issue that should concern us.

While the bill that the House will consider on Friday has scaled back some of the tax cuts on dividends and capital gains, I strongly urge the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means to consider the effects of their proposals on the Territories that implement the mirror tax code such as Guam.

We on Guam would like to see offsets for tax cuts that Congress imposes. This may not be possible, but there are other ways that the Federal Government can help us to mitigate the effects of tax cuts. For example, we would like to see an increase in Compact-impact reimbursement to Guam to cover the actual costs of Compact immigration. We would like to have the Medicaid costs fully reimbursed, not capped by statute. Finally, we would like to see Supplemental Security Income extended to the Territory of Guam.

Any or all of these measures would help us to mitigate the effects of whichever tax cut Congress decides on. So my message today, Mr. Speaker, is that the Territories present unique situations that should be examined whenever Federal policy is considered and most importantly Federal tax policy.

#### ASTHMA PREPAREDNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today is World Asthma Day, and tomorrow is Asthma Awareness Day on Capitol Hill.

I am co-chair along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS). Tomorrow I will be introducing legislation with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) called ASTHMA 2003. We intend to offer this legislation, and we think my colleagues should take a look at it and I hope they will cosponsor it.

But today I want all of us to think about this disease which is increasing astonishingly rapidly and it is affecting 20 million Americans, over 5 million of which are children who are in school. Asthma is the most common cause of missed schooldays. That is 14 million annually. It costs us tremendously in lost time learning, lost productivity and earnings and medical expenses, including of course costly emergency room visits.

While scientists work to understand asthma's prevalence and pharmaceutical makers discover new treatments, caring doctors, nurses and respiratory therapists dutifully diagnose and educate patients and parents and children with asthma soldier along, one different aspect I would like to talk about is the importance of remembering asthma medication in the role of self-preparation for emergencies. The events of this past year have heightened our collective consciousness to planning ahead and being ready for the unexpected and symptom-relieving, lifesaving asthma and allergy medication should be a part of every diagnosed individual or their family's "go-kit."

Did anyone see the movie "Signs" last summer when the family hid out in the basement but the father in his haste forgot to grab his asthmatic son's inhaler, the bronchodilator? By the time of escape, the son had to be revived out of his throat-closing reaction with an injection of epinephrine. That is a scary, sobering image. So remember critical medications to treat asthma and severe allergy reactions in the plans. Good resources to follow are the Federal Government's website, [www.ready.gov](http://www.ready.gov), or ones operated by the American Red Cross or numerous other organizations.

Take us here in the Capitol. It is possible that rather than evacuation, we may be sheltered in place if there is a biological, chemical, or radiological event in the local area. If my colleagues or their families or anybody in the Capitol have allergies or asthma, do they have an extra inhaler in their desk drawer? I ask the Members to please remember this: To encourage their staff and our House employees to plan for such a contingency.

I would like to end with a heartening asthma story which I think comes to the point. In Operation Iraqi Freedom, our Army medical personnel provided a very touching story of treating injured, sick and pregnant civilians, perhaps more than a season of "M\*A\*S\*H" episodes, but I found one especially inspiring. The Washington Post reported this on April 2, reported that Rashed Mhammad, his wife, Sikara, and their

son approached U.S. soldiers with their 3-year-old daughter, Rajwa. She was breathing laboredly in rapid gasps. The family could not afford the medical fees at the Iraqi hospital, and the parents feared their daughter would die.

A team led by Captain Eric Schobitz, 30, an Army doctor from Fairfax, administered oxygen and intravenous drip and antibiotics. "She has pneumonia and is also suffering from an asthma attack," he said. Equally important to arresting her acute episode, the Captain Schobitz showed her mother how to administer the inhaler and instructed the family to return if she showed no improvement in 2 days. And at this point, God willing, we are assuming she had a good outcome.

This underscores what I always promote and what my bill tomorrow addresses: Asthma management involves a committed team of the provider, the parents, and the child. I pray for this little girl's good health. I salute Captain Schobitz and urge us to remember asthma and allergy medication in our emergency preparedness efforts and wish all asthmatic children well on the eve of Asthma Awareness Day, which is going to be here in the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, please join us tomorrow in the Cannon Caucus Room from 1 o'clock to 2 p.m. for a press conference, followed by a free asthma screening for all House Members, staff and all employees.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m. today.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

Lord God of Heaven and Earth, as Members of the House of Representatives gather to reflect upon the most significant needs of this Nation and make decisions that will shape its future, be very present to each of them with the piercing light of pure wisdom.

Scatter the clouds of self-interest and personal dismay that Your greater purpose may be realized in them.

Holy and Immortal One, all the elements of nature obey Your commands.

Calm the severe storms that have threatened Your people.

Grant compassionate help, protection, renewed faith and love to all who have lost family, home or treasured belongings due to destructive violence.

Turn human fear of Your power into praise of Your goodness.

We, people who trust in You, pray now and 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 her approval thereof.

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. STEARNS 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.

#### FRANCE SHOWS NO FRIENDSHIP TO THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, today in the Washington Times it was reported that France supplied Iraqi officials passports as they fled U.S. forces, this allegation coming on the heels of another report that French companies sold military spare parts to Iraq shortly before the war. These passports gave the Iraqis who originally fled into Syria the ability to move freely among 12 European Union countries. This means that France gave Hussein's regime officials a get-out-of-jail-free card to escape.

I would like to remind my colleagues that these officials were part of a regime that is responsible for an estimated over 200,000 Iraqis having disappeared over the years, with many of them likely ending up in the secret mass graves that we continue to discover.

In reality, this allegation should come as no surprise. Rather than joining in promoting a free Iraq, the sheer magnitude of France's opposition to coalition actions demonstrates an affinity for this despotic regime.

As France seeks to repair its friendship with the United States, we should ask the question: With friends like that, who needs enemies?

#### DO NOT TURN OUR BACK ON THE SUDAN

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, several weeks ago Cuba was reelected to the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Given

the U.N.'s record, that is not surprising. But more shocking is the Human Rights Commission's treatment of the Sudan. From its northern perch in Khartoum, the Sudanese government has conducted a self-declared jihad against the country's Christian population in the south.

The government has killed 2 million, allowed the enslavement of tens of thousands, and displaced nearly 5 million, and the death toll keeps rising. Somehow the U.N. is willing to ignore these facts.

It has pulled all human rights observers and appears to have declared Sudan slave-free. But we cannot turn our back even if the U.N. has turned theirs. Sudan continues the enslavement and massacre of its Christian population. Sudan's complete disregard for human life and eager support of the slave trade deserve our condemnation.

The Human Rights Commission should reverse its decision, and this Congress should continue to pressure Sudan to end the massacre of its own citizens.

#### HONORING TARA OGLE

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Tara Ogle, a paramedic in St. Cloud, Minnesota, as this year's recipient of the Minnesota Stars of Life award. The Stars of Life award is given each year to an emergency medical service professional who has demonstrated outstanding service to their profession through communication skills, customer service, and job performance.

Nominated by her team captain in St. Cloud, Tara exemplifies the quality of bravery and caring held by EMS professionals. For example, she recently responded to a call from a family whose child had died. While the parents, understandably distraught, were handling matters with local law enforcement, Tara took extra time with their children and explained what had happened in terms that they could understand. Often in intense emotional situations like this, the needs of children are overlooked. Tara made sure that this did not happen and did her best to ensure that the other children were comforted during this difficult time.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Tara Ogle and all EMS professionals on their hard work and dedication to their jobs and patients and to our communities. I know we all appreciate the level of care they bring to their profession and are grateful for the service they provide.

#### 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.

**AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF BROCHURES ENTITLED "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE" AND "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT," THE PUBLICATION ENTITLED "OUR FLAG," THE DOCUMENT-SIZED ANNOTATED VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AND THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION**

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 139) authorizing printing of the brochures entitled "How Our Laws Are Made" and "Our American Government", the publication entitled "Our Flag", the document-sized, annotated version of the United States Constitution, and the pocket version of the United States Constitution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 139

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

#### **SECTION 1. HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—An edition of the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", as revised under the direction of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives in consultation with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$220,794, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

#### **SEC. 2. OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 2003 revised edition of the brochure entitled "Our American Government" shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$454,160, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

**SEC. 3. OUR FLAG.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 2003 revised edition of the publication entitled “Our Flag” shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$198,108, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

**SEC. 4. DOCUMENT-SIZED, ANNOTATED UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 2003 edition of the document-sized, annotated version of the United States Constitution shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$432,647, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

**SEC. 5. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 21st edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 550,000 copies of the document, of which 440,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$126,729, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise here today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 139. Now, this is not a major piece of legislation that is going to have mind-boggling results for the Nation, but what it is is something very important that is in the purview of the Committee on House Administration, and that is legislation that au-

thorizes the printing of the publication entitled “How Our Laws Are Made” and “Our American Government”, also the publication entitled “Our Flag”, the document-sized annotated version of the United States Constitution and the pocket version of the United States Constitution. I think that is an important responsibility of our committee.

It is the intention of the Committee on House Administration to make certain that these useful and important educational publications are made available to people. I want to say too that at every school group I try to personally deliver to each student, young American, some young, some older students, and many adults a copy of these treasured documents that contain the very foundation and basis for our government and for our freedoms. These publications are not only a resourceful means of information for Members’ offices but also a great learning tool for constituents of all ages.

Making these publications available to constituents not only helps them better understand how our government operates, but it also illustrates what their rights are and their responsibilities are in this as citizens of this great country. Our Nation’s parents, schools, and communities do a terrific job in teaching the rich history and structure of our government, and I hope these publications will provide additional tools and resources that can continue that tradition and I know that they will.

Each publication will have 550,000 copies printed, of which 430,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the other body, and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing. Each Member and Senator shall receive 1,000 copies of these publications and they will be delivered to each Member of the House and the other body’s offices. The cost of these publications will be incurred from the Congressional Printing and Binding Fund, and for additional copies, Members have the opportunity to purchase them from the Superintendent of Documents.

It is important that every student in a democracy be absolutely familiar with the very basic principles and values for which our country stands and on which it is based. These documents provide a very articulate description and really an enumeration of those principles and even illustrates how we debate and resolve differences of opinion and how this body, the people’s body, operates this institution that has survived for some two centuries of democratic representative government.

So we hope to extend, again, the understanding to students of all ages, young people and adults. We hope to have a better understanding, again, of the basic foundations of the process of government, and these publications will help in that important responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

I am delighted to cosponsor and support House Concurrent Resolution 139. This resolution, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) ably explained, authorizes the printing of brochures entitled “How Our Laws Are Made”, “Our American Government”, and the publication entitled “Our Flag”, the document-sized annotated version of the United States Constitution and the pocket version of the United States Constitution, both vitally important to so many of our constituents and used by so many of our colleagues here to impart information about our government and our Constitution to our citizens.

Madam Speaker, these documents are more than just handy reference materials. Collectively they explain how our federal system of government works, contain the essential documents on which the government is based, including the Declaration of Independence, and answer a wide range of questions frequently asked of our constitutional system.

They are, in a word, indispensable to every American and should be made widely available to every person who seeks answers about what it means to live in the United States. The resolution before us will do just that. I urge the House to support the concurrent resolution.

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if during today’s proceedings concerning the Joint Committee on Printing that I did not mention that one of the institution’s finest employees, Mike Harrison, who is on the minority staff and is minority staff director for the Joint Committee on Printing, is not here today. Normally, Mike would be here right by my side.

□ 1415

He has helped me in the past shepherd through legislation. Unfortunately, Mike is home recovering from an ailment and cannot be here today. The good news is that he is doing quite well and convalescing at home. I spoke with both him and his wife, Lori; and I know so many from here send their best wishes for his speedy recovery. He is as witty as ever, and we look forward to his speedy return.

Madam Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In conclusion, again, I am here to present House Concurrent Resolution 139, which authorizes the publication of some very important documents, including the Constitution of the United States, “Our Flag” and “How Our Laws Are Made,” tools that are important to constituents, to students, and a great

resource of this body, a somewhat mundane, but necessary, obligation of the Committee on House Administration.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration on which I am privileged to serve, is not able to be with us; but I know he supports this publication and also this House concurrent resolution, and I am honored to have the opportunity to act in his stead, to move and recommend for passage by the House H. Con. Res. 139. I urge passage of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 139.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H. Con. Res. 139, the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY OF UNITED STATES CONGRESS, 1774-2005

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 138) authorizing the printing of the Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 138

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

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF PRINTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be printed as a House document a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the United States Congress for the period ending with the 108th Congress.

(b) SPECIFICATIONS.—The document described in subsection (a) shall be in the style, form, manner, and binding as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing after consultation with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate. The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall each provide appropriate biographical data and other material for the document, including data for—

(1) Senators and individuals who have served in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, to be provided by the Secretary of the Senate; and

(2) Members of the House of Representatives (including Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress), to be provided by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(c) NUMBER OF COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed with suitable binding the lesser of—

(1) 1,280 copies of the document, of which 250 shall be for the use of the Senate, 930 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 100 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) a number of copies that does not have a total production and printing cost of more than \$96,500.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise here today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 138. This bill authorizes the printing of the "Biographical Directory of the United States Congress," again, something rather mundane but something necessary and the responsibility of the Committee on House Administration to make this publication available for both the historical, for research and for access of information purposes.

This is the first Federal Government printing of this publication since the 1989 bicentennial edition published pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 85 passed in the 99th Congress.

This particular edition of the "Biographical Directory" will include over 12,000 entries providing valuable information about the individuals who have served in the Continental Congresses, as well as each man and woman who served the 1st through the 108th Congress. Since the first bicentennial edition, there have been an additional 1,198 Members who have become Representatives, and it will also include rosters of State congressional delegations and elected officers.

Under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate will be responsible for the composition of new entries, as well as review all existing entries for accuracy and completeness. The Joint Committee on Printing has been responsible for the compilation and issuance of the "Biographical Directory" since 1928.

This edition of it would be the 16th in a series of such reference works published over the past 140 years, beginning with the 1859 publication of the "Dictionary of Congress," which was a collection of biographers of former and sitting Members of Congress gathered by Charles Lanman, former secretary to Daniel Webster.

This particular publication will complement the online biographical directory, [bioguide.congress.gov](http://bioguide.congress.gov), which was first posted in the late 1990s and has been maintained by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage and support of this particular measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume; and I, again, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Speaker, as the Chair and many of our colleagues know, I am an avid student of this great institution and its history and was proud to sponsor legislation, along with the Chair, that led to the writing of the history of the House by Professor Remini; and it should, therefore, be no surprise that I am an enthusiastic cosponsor of this resolution authorizing the printing of the "Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774 to 2005."

The volume, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) pointed out, was last printed in 1989 for the bicentennial of the establishment of the United States Government under the Constitution and before that in 1971. The Joint Committee on Printing has supervised the biographical directory's printing since 1928.

In the 1989 edition, the "Biographical Directory" listed more than 11,000 men and women who have served in the Congress of the United States, as well as the Continental Congress. The new and revised directory will contain more than 12,000 entries, as well as provide updated information on Members who were included in the 1989 edition.

There is no question that the new directory, like the 1989 edition, will promote a richer understanding of the contributions that the men and women of Congress have made over the 200 years of national growth, challenge, and change.

Some, like Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, and Daniel Webster, were the heroes of their age. Others, like Jeannette Rankin, Margaret Chase Smith, and Shirley Chisholm, broke significant race and gender boundaries while rendering notable public service. Countless others have worked quietly behind the scenes, like the Chair, Madam Speaker, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) seated to my right, and my esteemed colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The new edition of the "Biographical Directory" of the United States Congress will gather in one updated volume useful historical information for teachers, students, and others describing the careers of the men and women who have served in the United States Congress.

To be sure, much of the material in the biographical directory is available through the Clerk of the House Web site; but there is much that is not, such as listings of the congressional memberships by State and the multiple changes that occurred in each of those Congresses. There is much to be said to be able to leaf through a volume rich in historical detail and discover its secrets rather than simply researching specific items on the Web.

The "Biographical Directory" is an invaluable resource to students, teachers, historians, and all citizens who are interested in the history and the personalities of this great deliberative body. Anytime that we walk through these hallowed hallways or in Statuary Hall, where generations before President Lincoln sat, John Quincy Adams sat, it should give everyone in this body pause to celebrate the great institution that the House of Representatives is.

I urge my colleagues to support the concurrent resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I do not have any additional speakers at this time. I am urged to stall a bit because we are waiting the arrival of another Member on another issue, but I would be glad to let the gentleman have this time and then have a few remarks on closing.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, but I would like to note for the record that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) was a student of Professor Remini's in college; and we do not know what his grade point average was, but nonetheless we are proud to note that he was a student at that time.

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

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

I want to take just a minute since we do have some extra time, if I may, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and the minority staff, the other half of the Committee on House Administration. I have served on the committee in some rough times, and I am glad to say that I have served on the committee in some good times, good, bipartisan times; and no one has done a better job in service to any committee as ranking member than the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

I have seen the manner in which he has conducted the important business of the Committee on House Administration. It basically runs the House of Representatives and takes it on in a serious, bipartisan manner; and I want to compliment him and the staff for working together.

We have got a number of important projects, not just these mundane passage of publications that we are doing here, the construction of the visitors center, the oversight and again the operations of this institution, which belongs to the American people; but I do respect so much his work and his effort.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is not with us at this time, and I have the privilege of handling these measures for him; and it is indeed an honor to work with such distinguished colleagues, both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Con-

necticut (Mr. LARSON), on this important legislation and responsibility of the Committee on House Administration.

Also, I must say that I am so glad that we will be publishing a "Biographical Directory of the United States Congress," if for no other reason to get the Mica brothers straightened out. As my colleagues may know, and I was told by the former historian of the House, that the Mica brothers are the only two brothers since 1889 to serve in Congress from the same family but different political parties. We have the Kennedys all of one ilk, and we have the Hutchinsons all of another party; but my brother and I got separated somewhere slightly after birth.

He served with distinction as a member of the Democrat Party in the majority from 1978 to 1988, and I came in 1992. So, unfortunately, the Congress has been burdened with the Miccas for 2 decades; but since I am not in this most recent publication, at least people will understand that there are two of these folks from different political parties and hopefully actually educate some of the Members who have introduced me as Dan Mica on numerous occasions, both from the Democrat side and the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his gracious accolades, and I want my colleague to know that many Democrats, along with the gentleman's mother, pray continually for his conversion; but nonetheless, we are proud to note how well the gentleman has distinguished himself on the floor of the House, our great House and also as a person who has championed bipartisanship and the great role that he has also played along with his lovely wife in terms of making the annual bipartisan, biannual, bipartisan retreat such an enormous success because of his care for this great institution of ours.

Mr. MICA. Again, I am deeply indebted to the gentleman for his kind words, not only about me and my brother and the Democrat side of my family, but also for mentioning my long-enduring and suffering-of-31-years wife. That will certainly enhance the remainder of my day.

□ 1430

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 138.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H. Con. Res. 138, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### TIMOTHY MICHAEL GAFFNEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1596) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2318 Woodson Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Timothy Michael Gaffney Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1596

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

#### SECTION 1. TIMOTHY MICHAEL GAFFNEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2318 Woodson Road in St. Louis, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Timothy Michael Gaffney Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Timothy Michael Gaffney Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1596.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1596, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2318 Woodson Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the Timothy Michael Gaffney Post Office Building. The entire delegation from the State of Missouri has cosponsored this legislation.

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that today this House will honor one of the most devoted and distinguished members of the U.S. Postal Service community by naming one of its facilities after him. Timothy Michael Gaffney worked for the Post Service in St.

Louis since 1967, when he began his career as a substitute city letter carrier. He served the Postal Service in many capacities before reaching the rank of Customer Service Manager at St. Louis' Overland postal facility.

Sadly, the St. Louis area and all of America suddenly lost Mr. Gaffney on December 26 at the age of only 54. I commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for introducing this meaningful measure that celebrates the life and career of Mr. Gaffney. His outstanding resume includes the position of Superintendent of Branch Operations, Network Planning Specialist, and Manager of Customer Service for several USPS branches in St. Louis. He will be missed, and I hope that the Gaffney family will take some comfort in the likelihood that soon a postal facility in Mr. Gaffney's hometown will be named after him.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 1596 to honor the legacy of Timothy Michael Gaffney's career with the United States Postal Service.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise as a sponsor of H.R. 1596, a bill to honor the memory of U.S. Postal Service employee Timothy Michael Gaffney, and would like to thank the membership of the entire Missouri delegation for their cosponsorship on this measure.

Mr. Gaffney, while a manager at the Overland Post Office for 2 short years, made a huge impact on the employees there. In the words of one co-worker, Leslie Beck, "He was a personable manager who managed with a huge heart. He continued to help his employees with their personal problems, such as death of elderly parents. We had an employee pass away with cancer, another employee's wife who passed away with cancer at age 49, and yet another employee's daughter who passed away at age 10 with a brain tumor. This was all in the year 2002. It was a very emotional year for all of us, but he was there as support to all of us.

"Then Tim's passing in December 2002 was devastating to all of us. We are working through our grief by planting a tree, purchasing a nice bench and putting it in a peaceful area at the Post Office, and purchasing a memorial plaque for Tim. We have raised almost \$600 from just our employees for these projects. We have not asked for or would take money from anywhere else. This had to be all from just us. We are his 'Postal Family'. He was there for us, and we are there for him."

Madam Speaker, renaming the Overland Post Office in honor of Mr. Gaffney would appear to be a fitting reminder of his role and dedication to the community.

I would be remiss if I did not share the full scope of Mr. Gaffney's life both on the job and in his private life. Born on October 30, 1948, Mr. Gaffney was

the son of Joseph and Lorayne Gaffney, both deceased as well. A sister Jill Delonjay, and a brother, Mark Gaffney, both live in the St. Louis area, as does a nephew, Tom Harris, who also works for the U.S. Postal Service. Divorced, Mr. Gaffney had no children.

As a youngster, he attended Buder Elementary School and Christian Brothers College High School. It was shortly after high school graduation that he began working part-time at a local Post Office in the St. Louis area. In 1972, Mr. Gaffney received a teaching degree from the University of Missouri at St. Louis. Also, he served proudly and honorably in the Missouri Army National Guard from 1970 to 1976.

He remained active in alumni activities at the Christian Brothers College High School and an avid golfer; he supported the school's charitable golf tournaments, as well as being a great supporter of CBC's football team. Mr. Gaffney showered other organizations with his support, including the Backstoppers and their support for firefighters and police officers. Working with the Combined Federal Campaign in the Postal Service, Mr. Gaffney helped the Overland Station rank number 5 in the St. Louis area for donations to charities. It was very important to him to support charities.

Finally, a big Rams football fan, he was a season ticket holder. I urge Members to support this measure in tribute to a man whose life meant so much to his co-workers and his community.

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for introducing this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1596.

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. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ROBERT P. HAMMER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1625) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 Main Avenue in Clifton, New Jersey, as the "Robert P. Hammer Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1625

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

#### SECTION 1. ROBERT P. HAMMER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 Main Avenue in Clifton, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Robert P. Hammer Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Robert P. Hammer Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1625.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1625, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 Main Avenue in Clifton, New Jersey, as the Robert P. Hammer Post Office Building. The entire delegation from the State of New Jersey has cosponsored this legislation.

Madam Speaker, Robert P. Hammer was the highly regarded city manager of the New York City suburb of Clifton. He was credited with promoting rapid business expansion which helped to revitalize this northeastern New Jersey community. He improved countless roads, city parks, and single-handedly orchestrated a complex reorganization of city departments that greatly increased their efficiency. Unfortunately, Mr. Hammer's 7-year tenure as Clifton city manager and his distinguished life was cut tragically short when he passed away last December 20, just over 1 week before the beginning of his retirement.

By scanning the news clips that covered his funeral service last December, the words that appear time and again to describe Mr. Hammer include "wonderful," "respected," "friend," "leader" and even "hero." The prayers and condolences of this House go out to Mr. Hammer's wife, Kathleen, and their five children, Megan, Sean, Kelly, Staci and Brett. He was a man who was genuinely devoted to public service. He cared deeply about his community, his friends, and his family, and worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life for all Clifton residents.

I urge all Members to honor Mr. Hammer by supporting the passage of H.R. 1625.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) for his generous words.

I want to also thank this Congress for moving this and putting this on a fast track. Hopefully next month this Post Office will open up, and it will be a fitting gesture from Congress.

I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 1625, legislation to name the new postal facility in Clifton, New Jersey, after a really great public servant, Robert P. "Bob" Hammer, former city manager of Clifton, New Jersey.

He was a man who understood what public service was all about. He was honest. His word was his bond. He had integrity. He was a fixture at city hall and in the community, a leader who worked each day to improve the life of every Clifton resident. He was a city manager for 7 years before succumbing to a serious health problem in December 2002 at the age of 54.

In his position as city manager, Madam Speaker, Bob Hammer oversaw a blooming Main Avenue business district. How many towns throughout this landscape we call America are older towns trying to fight back and become part of the economic dream. It is our hope that the new downtown Post Office will be an anchor that holds the redevelopment together and brings residents down to the local businesses. This was one of his dreams.

Naming this Post Office after Bob is an appropriate tribute for an extraordinary individual. He helped improve city parks and playgrounds and ushered in scores of new businesses and homes to this great city even during very tough economic times. He was credited with guiding Clifton through a period of economic growth all while maintaining minimal tax increases. There is no question that Robert Hammer left Clifton a better city than when he started.

How often can we say that for individuals throughout this great country, and that is all anybody can ever ask of us, did we leave the place a little better than how we found it?

A father of five, Bob Hammer developed strong friendships with his humor and his professionalism. He was a leader in the truest sense of word, and a tremendous public servant. My friend and mayor of Clifton, New Jersey, James Anzaldi, said that never in his 30 years of service in Clifton government has he known anyone with Hammer's leadership qualities.

A native of Stanhope, New Jersey, Bob earned a Master's Degree in public administration from Farleigh Dickinson University, and a Bachelor's Degree in commerce from Rider College.

□ 1445

He was a member of the New Jersey and International City Managers Association,

the New Jersey Finance Officers Association, and New Jersey International Clerks' Association. He was also an adjunct staff member of Montclair State University, which is also in the Eighth Congressional District.

Before working for Clifton, Bob Hammer was a borough administrator in Oakland, Bergen County, and borough administrator in Bloomingdale, Passaic County. He was a parishioner of St. Philip the Apostle Roman Catholic Church in Clifton and a member of the St. Philip's Knights of Columbus. He was also a past president of the Clifton Rotary. He was a dedicated husband and a great father and son. I know how proud the whole family feels about him.

Our thoughts are with his wife Kathy; his five children, Megan, Kelly, Sean, Brett and Staci; and his parents, Stanley and Vera Hammer, of Stanhope, New Jersey. My staff and I have fond memories of working with Bob on a host of issues over the years. He was on my transportation advisory committee. We worked on Clifton highway interchanges, access to mass transit facilities, and pedestrian safety measures. Government and politics is all local, as someone who stood in your place, Madam Speaker, said many, many times.

Most recently, I was able to work with Mayor Anzaldi and Bob and other Clifton officials and representatives of the U.S. Postal Service to make the new postal facility in Clifton, New Jersey, a reality. The new postal building, which is currently in its final phase of construction, is on schedule to be completed next month. It will service the people of Clifton. The fact that this construction got done at all is a tribute to Bob Hammer.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to pass this fitting tribute to my friend and our friend, Bob Hammer.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for introducing this legislation. I urge all Members to support the passage of this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply join with the gentleman from New Jersey in promoting passage of this resolution. I think he has eloquently spoken of the tremendous value of Mr. Hammer to the community where he lived and worked. I simply join with him and urge swift passage of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1625, which names a facility of the U.S. Postal Service, located at 1114 Main Avenue in Clifton, New Jersey, after Robert P. Hammer, was introduced by Representative BILL PASCRELL (D-NJ) on April 3, 2003.

Mr. Robert Hammer served as the Clifton City Manager for seven years before he

passed away on December 20, 2002. Long heralded as a distinguished public servant, Mr. Hammer held a number of important positions in city government.

A native of Stanhope, New Jersey, Mr. Hammer had a bachelor's degree in Commerce from Rider College and a master's degree in public administration from Farleigh Dickinson University. In addition, he was a certified municipal finance officer and a registered municipal clerk. He served on numerous State associations and was known throughout the State for his leadership ability and for being inclusive and promoting unity.

Madam Speaker, the Mayor and City Council of Clifton, New Jersey, support this bill. As I understand it, the postal facility to be named after Mr. Hammer, is being built in Clifton and should be operational this month.

I support this measure and urge its swift passage.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1625.

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. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**DR. CAESAR A.W. CLARK, SR.  
POST OFFICE BUILDING**

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1740) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1502 East Kiest Boulevard in Dallas, Texas, as the "Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark, Sr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1740

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

**SECTION 1. DR. CAESAR A.W. CLARK, SR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1502 East Kiest Boulevard in Dallas, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark, Sr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark, Sr. Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1740, introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1502 East Kiest Boulevard in Dallas, Texas, as the Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark, Sr. Post Office Building. The entire delegation from the State of Texas has cosponsored this legislation.

Madam Speaker, by renaming this post office for Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark, this House will commemorate a remarkable American. Dr. Clark has served as the venerated pastor of Good Street Baptist Church in Dallas for over 50 years and is well known throughout the Dallas-Fort Worth area. At 88 years of age, Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark still preaches on Sundays at Good Street Baptist Church. He has delivered his vibrant sermons all over the world during his extraordinary career in the clergy. In addition, he has served as president of the Missionary Baptist Association of Texas and as vice president of the National Baptist Convention.

Growing up, Caesar Clark could not continue in school past the seventh grade because his help was too valuable to the family farm. He ultimately educated himself during his teenage years and earned admittance to Bishop College from which he graduated in 1946. In 1950, he became pastor at Good Street Baptist.

While his professional focus has always been squarely on the valued worshippers at Good Street Baptist, Dr. Clark is also an involved community leader who continues to enjoy membership on the Boy Scouts of America Advisory Committee and the Dallas Black Chamber of Commerce. In addition, Dr. Clark played an active role in our Nation's civil rights struggle. Perhaps most notably he was responsible for drawing Dr. Martin Luther King to his church in 1958 for his first of many speeches in Dallas.

Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark's life is one of dedicated service, compassion, faith, and devotion. For all these reasons, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 1740, which names this Dallas post office building after Dr. Clark. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for introducing this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I might note that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is returning from the Persian Gulf and is unable to be here at the moment with us. I would read her statement into the RECORD:

H.R. 1740, Legislation to Designate the Caesar A.W. Clark, Sr. Post Office. The Honorable EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas in the House of Representatives.

"Madam Speaker, H.R. 1740 designates a post office located at 1502 East Kiest Boulevard in Dallas, Texas, as H.R. 1740 enjoys the support and co-sponsorship of the entire Texas delegation.

"Madam Speaker, during his 50-year tenure of the Good Street Baptist Church, Reverend Caesar A.W. Clark has provided a wealth of services to thousands of Dallas residents. Leading by example is how Reverend Clark became a pillar of the Dallas community. As an early pioneer in the civil rights movement, Reverend Clark was responsible for the first visit to Dallas by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Following that 1958 visit, Reverend Clark continued to work to end segregation in Dallas.

"We honor Reverend Clark, a nationally renowned member of the clergy, humanitarian and respected leader that *Ebony* magazine has twice named one of the 15 "Outstanding Black Preachers in America." Under his leadership at Good Street Baptist Church, the church has progressively grown by establishing two day care centers, a free legal clinic, and a federally assisted complex for the elderly. Of particular note in the 1950s, a time when credit was expensive and loan sharks took advantage of people, Reverend Clark organized to create a church credit union. Today, the Good Street Baptist Church has more than \$1.2 million in assets and serves nearly 1,500 members and their families. Indeed, this is an honor for Reverend Clark who has served as a vice president of the National Baptist Convention and president of the Missionary Baptist Association of Texas. He has been a source of spiritual inspiration for some of Dallas' oldest African American families and many of our political and civic leaders. While sharing knowledge with residents and cultivating their humility, he is still dedicated to his congregation and to his daily work at Good Street Baptist.

"The designation of this post office acknowledges Reverend Clark's outstanding contributions as pastor at Good Street Baptist Church for more than 5 decades.

"Born in 1914 in Louisiana, Reverend Clark was subjected to a 'Jim Crow' South, a time when nearly all African Americans were not allowed an equal opportunity to receive a quality education. Determined to not let adversity remain a barrier, Reverend Clark studied independently and gained admission to Bishop College. Reverend Clark graduated from there in 1946.

"Reverend Clark is known throughout the State of Texas as a remarkable pastor and dedicated leader who views the community as extended family. I can think of no one more deserving of this honor.

"Madam Speaker, we wish to congratulate Reverend Clark on the designation of this post office and for his many years of service and dedication to the Good Street Baptist Church and citizens of Dallas. His achievements are an inspiration to all of us."

I commend the gentlewoman from Texas for extending to the good reverend this honor.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to make this statement on behalf of legislation I sponsored honoring a great Texan and American.

H.R. 1740 designates a post office located at 1502 East Kiest Boulevard in Dallas, Texas, as the Caesar A.W. Clark Post Office. H.R. 1740 enjoys the support and co-sponsorship of the entire Texas delegation.

Madam Speaker, during his 50 year tenure of the Good Street Baptist Church, Reverend Caesar A.W. Clark has provided a wealth of services to thousands of Dallas residents. Leading by example is how Rev. Clark became a pillar of the Dallas community. As an early pioneer in the civil rights movement, Rev. Clark was responsible for the first visit to Dallas by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Following that 1958 visit, Rev. Clark continued to work to end segregation in Dallas.

I rise to honor Rev. Caesar Clark, a nationally renowned member of the clergy, humanitarian, and respected leader *Ebony* magazine has twice named one of the fifteen "Outstanding Black Preachers in America". Under his leadership at Good Street Baptist Church, the church has progressively grown by establishing two day care centers, a free legal clinic and a federally assisted complex for the elderly. Of particular note in the 1950's, a time when credit was expensive and loansharks took advantage of people, Rev. Clark organized to create a church credit union. Today, the Good Street Baptist Church has more than \$1.2 million in assets and serves nearly 1,500 members and their families.

Indeed this is an honor for Rev. Clark, who has served as a Vice President of the National Baptist Association of Texas. He has been a source of spiritual inspiration for some of Dallas' oldest African-American families and many of our political and civic leaders. While sharing knowledge with residents and cultivating their humility, he is still dedicated to his congregation and to his daily work at Good Street Baptist.

The designation of this post office acknowledges Rev. Clark's outstanding contributions as pastor at Good Street Baptist Church for more than five decades.

Born in 1914 in Louisiana, Rev. Clark was subjected to a "Jim Crow" south, a time nearly all African-Americans were not allowed an equal opportunity to receive a quality education. Determined to not let adversity remain a barrier, Rev. Clerk studied independently and gained admission into Bishop College. Rev. Clark graduated from there in 1946.

Rev. Clark is known throughout the state of Texas as a remarkable pastor and dedicated leader, who views the community as extended

family. I can think of no one more deserving of this honor.

Madam Speaker, I wish to congratulate Rev. Clark on the designation of this post office and for his many years of service and dedication to the Good Street Baptist Church and citizens of Dallas.

His achievements are an inspiration to us all.

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for introducing this legislation. I urge all Members to support the adoption of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1740.

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. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ADMIRAL DONALD DAVIS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1609) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, as the "Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1609

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

#### SECTION 1. ADMIRAL DONALD DAVIS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, and known as the Brookfield Main Office, shall be known and designated as the "Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under considerations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1609, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), redesignates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, as the Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building. The entire delegation from the State of Missouri has cosponsored this legislation.

Madam Speaker, this bill honors a true American combat hero. Admiral Donald Davis served as a sailor and later as an aviator in three wars for the U.S. Navy. His esteemed career covered 38 years following his graduation from the Naval Academy in 1943.

During World War II, Admiral Davis took part in nine missions aboard the cruiser *Mobile* in the Pacific Theater. After earning his pilot's wings in 1946, Admiral Davis spent the next 12 years in naval fighter squadrons. During the Korean War, Admiral Davis flew 51 combat missions. Finally, while serving in the Vietnam War, he was assigned to be commanding officer of the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* in the Indian Ocean. Admiral Davis' career culminated with his tour as commander of the Pacific Fleet from May of 1978 to July of 1981. Among his many honors, Admiral Davis was awarded the Air Medal with a gold star, was twice awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, and earned the Legion of Merit four times.

Admiral Davis passed away in July of 1998, but I understand the gentleman from Missouri has known Admiral Davis and his wonderful family for some time. I am privileged to be a part of the consideration of this legislation that renames the post office in Brookfield after the distinguished Admiral Donald Davis.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 1609. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for introducing this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1609, which names a postal facility located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, after the late Admiral Donald Davis, was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) on April 3, 2003.

Admiral Davis had a very active and distinguished military career which spanned three wars: World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. A graduate of the United States Naval Academy, Admiral Davis flew with the Navy's first jet squadron, trained fighter pilots, and served as a commanding officer of the carrier *Kitty Hawk*.

During his career, which lasted almost 40 years, Admiral Davis received a number of distinguished and meritorious military declarations: two Distinguished Service Medals, four Legion of Merit, and an Air Medal with a gold star.

As a true hero and patriot, Admiral Donald Cooke Davis served his Nation and community with great honor. I commend my colleague for seeking to recognize the admiral's contributions in this manner. I urge swift adoption of this bill.

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

□ 1500

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1609.

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. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1835

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 766, NANOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-90) on the resolution (H. Res. 219) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 766) to provide for a National Nanotechnology Research and Development Program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1596, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1625, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1740, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H.R. 1609 will be postponed until tomorrow.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

TIMOTHY MICHAEL GAFFNEY  
POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1596.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1596, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—405

|                |                 |               |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie    | Burton (IN)     | Duncan        |
| Ackerman       | Calvert         | Dunn          |
| Aderholt       | Camp            | Edwards       |
| Akin           | Cannon          | Ehlers        |
| Alexander      | Cantor          | Emanuel       |
| Allen          | Capito          | Emerson       |
| Andrews        | Capps           | Engel         |
| Baca           | Capuano         | English       |
| Bachus         | Cardin          | Eshoo         |
| Baird          | Cardoza         | Etheridge     |
| Baker          | Carson (OK)     | Evans         |
| Baldwin        | Carter          | Everett       |
| Ballance       | Case            | Farr          |
| Ballenger      | Castle          | Fattah        |
| Barrett (SC)   | Chabot          | Feeney        |
| Bartlett (MD)  | Chocola         | Ferguson      |
| Barton (TX)    | Clay            | Filner        |
| Bass           | Clyburn         | Flake         |
| Beauprez       | Coble           | Fletcher      |
| Becerra        | Cole            | Foley         |
| Bell           | Collins         | Forbes        |
| Bereuter       | Cooper          | Ford          |
| Berkley        | Costello        | Fossella      |
| Berman         | Cox             | Frank (MA)    |
| Berry          | Cramer          | Franks (AZ)   |
| Biggert        | Crane           | Frelinghuysen |
| Bilirakis      | Crenshaw        | Frost         |
| Bishop (GA)    | Cubin           | Gallegly      |
| Bishop (NY)    | Culberson       | Garrett (NJ)  |
| Blackburn      | Cummings        | Gerlach       |
| Blumenauer     | Cunningham      | Gibbons       |
| Blunt          | Davis (AL)      | Gilchrest     |
| Boehlert       | Davis (CA)      | Gillmor       |
| Boehner        | Davis (FL)      | Gingrey       |
| Bonilla        | Davis (IL)      | Gonzalez      |
| Bono           | Davis (TN)      | Goode         |
| Boozman        | Davis, Jo Ann   | Goodlatte     |
| Boswell        | Davis, Tom      | Gordon        |
| Boucher        | DeFazio         | Goss          |
| Bradley (NH)   | Delahunt        | Granger       |
| Brady (PA)     | DeLauro         | Graves        |
| Brady (TX)     | DeLay           | Green (TX)    |
| Brown (OH)     | DeMint          | Green (WI)    |
| Brown (SC)     | Deutsch         | Greenwood     |
| Brown, Corrine | Diaz-Balart, M. | Grijalva      |
| Brown-Waite,   | Doggett         | Gutiérrez     |
| Ginny          | Dooley (CA)     | Gutknecht     |
| Burgess        | Doolittle       | Hall          |
| Burns          | Doyle           | Harman        |
| Burr           | Dreier          | Harris        |

|                |                |
|----------------|----------------|
| Hart           | McCrery        |
| Hastings (FL)  | McDermott      |
| Hastings (WA)  | McGovern       |
| Hayes          | McHugh         |
| Hayworth       | McInnis        |
| Hefley         | McIntyre       |
| Hensarling     | McKeon         |
| Herger         | McNulty        |
| Hill           | Meehan         |
| Hinchev        | Meek (FL)      |
| Hobson         | Meeks (NY)     |
| Hoefel         | Menendez       |
| Hoekstra       | Mica           |
| Holden         | Michaud        |
| Holt           | Millender-     |
| Honda          | McDonald       |
| Hooey (OR)     | Miller (FL)    |
| Hostettler     | Miller (MI)    |
| Houghton       | Miller (NC)    |
| Hoyer          | Miller, George |
| Hulshof        | Mollohan       |
| Hunter         | Moore          |
| Isakson        | Moran (KS)     |
| Israel         | Moran (VA)     |
| Issa           | Murphy         |
| Istook         | Murtha         |
| Jackson (IL)   | Musgrave       |
| Jackson-Lee    | Myrick         |
| (TX)           | Nadler         |
| Janklow        | Napolitano     |
| Jefferson      | Neal (MA)      |
| Jenkins        | Nethercutt     |
| Johnson (CT)   | Ney            |
| Johnson (IL)   | Northup        |
| Johnson, E. B. | Norwood        |
| Johnson, Sam   | Nunes          |
| Jones (NC)     | Nussle         |
| Jones (OH)     | Oberstar       |
| Kanjorski      | Obey           |
| Kaptur         | Olver          |
| Keller         | Ortiz          |
| Kelly          | Osborne        |
| Kennedy (MN)   | Owens          |
| Kennedy (RI)   | Oxley          |
| Kildee         | Pallone        |
| Kilpatrick     | Pascarell      |
| Kind           | Pastor         |
| King (IA)      | Paul           |
| King (NY)      | Pearce         |
| Kingston       | Pelosi         |
| Kirk           | Pence          |
| Klecicka       | Peterson (MN)  |
| Kline          | Peterson (PA)  |
| Knollenberg    | Petri          |
| Kolbe          | Pickering      |
| Kucinich       | Pitts          |
| LaHood         | Platts         |
| Lampson        | Pombo          |
| Langevin       | Pomeroy        |
| Lantos         | Porter         |
| Larson (CT)    | Portman        |
| Latham         | Price (NC)     |
| LaTourrette    | Pryce (OH)     |
| Leach          | Putnam         |
| Lee            | Quinn          |
| Levin          | Radanovich     |
| Lewis (CA)     | Rahall         |
| Lewis (GA)     | Ramstad        |
| Lewis (KY)     | Rangel         |
| Linder         | Regula         |
| Lipinski       | Rehberg        |
| LoBiondo       | Renzi          |
| Lofgren        | Reyes          |
| Lowey          | Reynolds       |
| Lucas (KY)     | Rodriguez      |
| Lucas (OK)     | Rogers (AL)    |
| Lynch          | Rogers (KY)    |
| Majette        | Rogers (MI)    |
| Maloney        | Rohrabacher    |
| Manzullo       | Ros-Lehtinen   |
| Markey         | Ross           |
| Marshall       | Rothman        |
| Matheson       | Royal-Allard   |
| Matsui         | Royce          |
| McCarthy (MO)  | Ruppersberger  |
| McCarthy (NY)  | Rush           |
| McCotter       | Ryan (OH)      |

## NOT VOTING—29

|             |                 |
|-------------|-----------------|
| Bishop (UT) | Diaz-Balart, L. |
| Bonner      | Dicks           |
| Boyd        | Dingell         |
| Buyer       | Gephardt        |
| Carson (IN) | Hinojosa        |
| Combest     | Hyde            |
| Conyers     | Insee           |
| Crowley     | John            |
| Deal (GA)   | Larsen (WA)     |
| DeGette     | McCollum        |

|                  |                |
|------------------|----------------|
| Ryan (WI)        | McCrery        |
| Ryun (KS)        | McDermott      |
| Sabo             | McGovern       |
| Sanchez, Linda   | McHugh         |
| T.               | McInnis        |
| Sanchez, Loretta | McIntyre       |
| Sanders          | McKeon         |
| Sandlin          | McNulty        |
| Saxton           | Meehan         |
| Schakowsky       | Meek (FL)      |
| Schiff           | Meeks (NY)     |
| Schrock          | Menendez       |
| Scott (GA)       | Mica           |
| Scott (VA)       | Michaud        |
| Sensenbrenner    | Millender-     |
| Serrano          | McDonald       |
| Sessions         | Miller (FL)    |
| Shadegg          | Miller (MI)    |
| Shaw             | Miller (NC)    |
| Shays            | Miller, George |
| Sherman          | Mollohan       |
| Sherwood         | Moore          |
| Shimkus          | Moran (KS)     |
| Shuster          | Moran (VA)     |
| Simmons          | Murphy         |
| Skelton          | Murtha         |
| Slaughter        | Musgrave       |
| Smith (MI)       | Myrick         |
| Smith (NJ)       | Nadler         |
| Smith (TX)       | Napolitano     |
| Smith (WA)       | Neal (MA)      |
| Snyder           | Nethercutt     |
| Solis            | Ney            |
| Souder           | Northup        |
| Spratt           | Norwood        |
| Stark            | Nunes          |
| Stearns          | Nussle         |
| Stenholm         | Oberstar       |
| Strickland       | Obey           |
| Stupak           | Olver          |
| Sullivan         | Ortiz          |
| Tancredo         | Osborne        |
| Tauscher         | Owens          |
| Taylor (MS)      | Oxley          |
| Taylor (NC)      | Pallone        |
| Terry            | Pascarell      |
| Thomas           | Pastor         |
| Thompson (CA)    | Paul           |
| Thompson (MS)    | Pearce         |
| Thornberry       | Pelosi         |
| Tiahrt           | Pence          |
| Tiberi           | Peterson (MN)  |
| Tierney          | Peterson (PA)  |
| Toomey           | Petri          |
| Towns            | Pickering      |
| Turner (OH)      | Pitts          |
| Turner (TX)      | Platts         |
| Udall (CO)       | Pombo          |
| Udall (NM)       | Pomeroy        |
| Upton            | Porter         |
| Van Hollen       | Portman        |
| Velazquez        | Price (NC)     |
| Visclosky        | Pryce (OH)     |
| Vitter           | Putnam         |
| Walden (OR)      | Quinn          |
| Walsh            | Radanovich     |
| Wamp             | Rahall         |
| Waters           | Ramstad        |
| Watson           | Rangel         |
| Watt             | Regula         |
| Waxman           | Rehberg        |
| Weiner           | Renzi          |
| Weldon (FL)      | Reyes          |
| Weldon (PA)      | Reynolds       |
| Wexler           | Rodriguez      |
| Whitfield        | Rogers (AL)    |
| Wicker           | Rogers (KY)    |
| Wilson (NM)      | Rogers (MI)    |
| Wilson (SC)      | Rohrabacher    |
| Wolf             | Ros-Lehtinen   |
| Woolsey          | Ross           |
| Wu               | Rothman        |
| Wynn             | Royal-Allard   |
| Young (AK)       | Royce          |
| Young (FL)       | Ruppersberger  |

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes left to vote.

□ 1855

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT P. HAMMER POST OFFICE  
BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1625.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1625, 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 405, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—405

|                |                |                 |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abercrombie    | Cantor         | Engel           |
| Ackerman       | Capito         | English         |
| Aderholt       | Capps          | Eshoo           |
| Akin           | Capuano        | Etheridge       |
| Alexander      | Cardin         | Evans           |
| Allen          | Cardoza        | Everett         |
| Andrews        | Carson (OK)    | Farr            |
| Baca           | Carter         | Fattah          |
| Bachus         | Case           | Feeney          |
| Baird          | Castle         | Ferguson        |
| Baker          | Chabot         | Filner          |
| Baldwin        | Chocola        | Flake           |
| Ballance       | Ballance       | Fletcher        |
| Ballenger      | Clay           | Foley           |
| Barrett (SC)   | Clyburn        | Forbes          |
| Bartlett (MD)  | Coble          | Ford            |
| Barton (TX)    | Cole           | Fossella        |
| Bass           | Collins        | Frank (MA)      |
| Beauprez       | Conyers        | Franks (AZ)     |
| Becerra        | Cooper         | Frost           |
| Bell           | Costello       | Gallegly        |
| Bereuter       | Cox            | Garrett (NJ)    |
| Berkley        | Cramer         | Gerlach         |
| Berman         | Crane          | Gibbons         |
| Berry          | Crenshaw       | Cubin           |
| Biggert        | Berry          | Gillmor         |
| Bilirakis      | Biggert        | Gingrey         |
| Bishop (GA)    | Bilirakis      | Gingrey         |
| Bishop (NY)    | Bishop (GA)    | Cunningham      |
| Blackburn      | Bishop (NY)    | Davis (AL)      |
| Blumenauer     | Blackburn      | Davis (CA)      |
| Blunt          | Blumenauer     | Davis (FL)      |
| Boehlert       | Blunt          | Davis (IL)      |
| Boehner        | Boehlert       | Davis (TN)      |
| Bonilla        | Boehner        | Davis, Jo Ann   |
| Bono           | Bonilla        | Davis, Tom      |
| Boozman        | Bono           | DeFazio         |
| Boswell        | Boozman        | Delahunt        |
| Boucher        | Boswell        | DeLauro         |
| Bradley (NH)   | Boucher        | DeLauro         |
| Brady (TX)     | Bradley (NH)   | DeLay           |
| Brown (OH)     | Brady (PA)     | DeMint          |
| Brown (SC)     | Brady (TX)     | DeMint          |
| Brown, Corrine | Brown (OH)     | Deutsch         |
| Brown-Waite,   | Brown (SC)     | Diaz-Balart, M. |
| Ginny          | Brown, Corrine | Doggett         |
| Burgess        | Brown-Waite,   | Dooley (CA)     |
| Burns          | Ginny          | Doolittle       |
| Burr           | Burgess        | Doyle           |
|                | Burns          | Dreier          |
|                | Burr           | Duncan          |
|                | Camp           | Dunn            |
|                | Cannon         | Edwards         |
|                |                | Ehlers          |
|                |                | Emmanuel        |
|                |                | Emerson         |

Hobson  
Hoefel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Isakson  
Mollohan  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Janklow  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klecza  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty

Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Walden (OR)  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryan (KS)  
Sabo

NOT VOTING—29

Bishop (UT)  
Bonner  
Boyd  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Carson (IN)  
Combest  
Crowley  
Deal (GA)  
DeGette

Diaz-Balart, L.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Frelinghuysen  
Gephardt  
Hinojosa  
Hyde  
Inslee  
John  
Larsen (WA)

Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Vislosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boucher  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain to vote.

□ 1902

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CAESAR A.W. CLARK, SR.  
POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1740.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1740, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bell  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boucher  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps

Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (OK)  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
DeFazio  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr

Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Green (FL)  
Greenwood  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hinchev  
Hobson  
Hoefel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hostettler  
Houghton

Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Janklow  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klecza  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica

NOT VOTING—29

DeGette  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Gephardt  
Hinojosa  
Hyde  
Inslee  
John  
Larsen (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are reminded that 2 minutes remain in the vote.

Sanders  
Sandlin  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryan (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

□ 1919

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcalls 159, 160, and 161.

#### MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 2003, CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 148, PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 108TH CONGRESS

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time on Wednesday, May 7, 2003, without intervention of any point of order to consider House Resolution 148;

The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment;

The amendment that I have placed at the desk (which reflects the amendment ordered reported by the Committee on House Administration) shall be considered as adopted;

The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to final adoption without intervening motion.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Eighth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$10,327,531; Committee on Armed Services, \$11,931,357; Committee on the Budget, \$11,869,572; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$14,673,371; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$18,622,138; Committee on Financial Services, \$13,696,487; Committee on Government Reform, \$19,614,435; Committee on House Administration, \$8,527,057; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$7,809,730; Committee on International Relations, \$14,552,695; Committee on the Judiciary, \$14,048,616; Committee on Resources,

\$13,509,424; Committee on Rules, \$5,669,311; Committee on Science, \$11,690,845; Committee on Small Business, \$5,120,301; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$3,071,250; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$16,461,893; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$5,486,795; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$15,976,288.

#### SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2003, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2004.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,084,900; Committee on Armed Services, \$5,871,876; Committee on the Budget, \$5,856,333; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$7,047,896; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,101,042; Committee on Financial Services, \$6,601,085; Committee on Government Reform, \$9,740,963; Committee on House Administration, \$4,122,092; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$3,780,487; Committee on International Relations, \$6,993,645; Committee on the Judiciary, \$6,957,554; Committee on Resources, \$6,492,029; Committee on Rules, \$2,797,898; Committee on Science, \$5,711,401; Committee on Small Business, \$2,535,261; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,527,825; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$7,982,558; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,703,328; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$7,828,037.

#### SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2004, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2005.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,242,632; Committee on Armed Services, \$6,059,481; Committee on the Budget, \$6,013,239; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$7,625,475; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,521,097; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,095,402; Committee on Government Reform, \$9,873,472; Committee on House Administration, \$4,404,965; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,029,243; Committee on International Relations, \$7,559,050; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,091,062; Committee on Resources, \$7,017,395; Committee on Rules, \$2,871,413; Committee on Science, \$5,979,444; Committee on Small Business, \$2,585,041; Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, \$1,543,425; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,479,334; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$2,783,466; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,148,251.

#### SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

#### SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

#### SEC. 6. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in

amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

Mr. LINDER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES-CHINA SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1238(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (P.L. 106-398) as amended by division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following members on the part of the House to the United States-China Security Review Commission:

Mr. Stephen D. Bryen, Maryland, for a term to expire December 31, 2005;

Ms. June Teufel Dreyer, Florida, for a term to expire December 31, 2003;

Mr. Larry Wortzel, Virginia, for a term to expire December 31, 2004.

#### BUY AMERICAN

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are losing our industrial base in this country. U.S. manufacturers have laid off 95,000 workers just in the month of April; and since July of 2000, we have lost 2.2 million manufacturing jobs in this country.

We have an obligation through the money we spend in this country to make sure that our companies are buying American. We need to strengthen the Buy American Act and strengthen the Berry amendment, which requires the Department of Defense to buy U.S.-made products.

Currently, we are buying our titanium from Russia to make military planes, and we are buying our tires for armored vehicles from France. Meanwhile, the average U.S. taxpayer is paying \$1,000 a year to fund the defense of this country.

We are willing to stop eating French fries to protest France; but where the rubber meets the road, the Department of Defense is out to lunch. The sad part is they are probably eating French fries.

CONGRATULATING TONY HOPSON ON BEING HONORED AS THIS YEAR'S FIRST CITIZEN OF PORTLAND

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this evening in Portland, Oregon, Tony Hopson is going to be recognized as our First Citizen, special recognition for a special gentleman who has developed an innovative program for young people that for 20 years has not only helped Portland's youth and stabilized our neighborhoods; it has provided significant impact in terms of being a critical foundation for the revitalization of critical areas of northeast Portland. Not only has his program touched the lives of thousands of young people; it has been a signal about how communities can come together and solve problems, bringing out the best in everyone. The success goes beyond our children and our neighborhoods. All who have had the privilege of working with him and his team have been influenced for the better.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our community is recognizing Mr. Hopson as our First Citizen, important recognition for an outstanding leader and an innovative program.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

#### THE WISDOM OF TAX CUTS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the current tax debate is more about politics than serious economics. Both sides use demagoguery but propose only modest tax cuts. The benefits that could come from the current tax cut proposal, unfortunately, are quite small and not immediate.

Some say tax cuts raise revenues by addressing economic activity, thus providing Congress with even more money to spend. Others say lowering taxes simply lowers revenues and increases deficits. Some say we must target tax cuts to the poor and the middle class so they will spend more money. Others say tax cuts should be targeted to the rich so they can invest and create jobs. We must accept that it is hard to give tax cuts to people who do not pay

taxes. But we could, if we wanted, cut payroll taxes for lower-income workers.

The truth is, government officials cannot know what consumers and investors will do if they get a tax cut. Plugging tax cut data into a computer and expecting an accurate projection of the economic outcome is about as reliable as asking Congress to project government surpluses. Two important points are purposely ignored: first, the money people earn is their own, and they have a moral right to keep as much of it as possible. It is not Congress' money to spend. Government spending is the problem. Taking a big chunk of the people's earnings out of the economy, whether through taxes or borrowing, is always harmful. Taxation is more honest and direct and the harm is less hidden. Borrowing, especially since the Federal Reserve creates credit out of thin air to loan to big spenders in Congress, is more deceitful. It hides the effects and delays the consequences. But over the long term, this method of financing is much more dangerous.

The process by which the Fed monetizes debt and accommodates Congress contributes to, if not causes, most of our problems. This process of government financing generates the business cycle and thus increases unemployment. It destroys the value of the dollar and thus causes price inflation. It encourages deficits by reducing restraints on congressional spending. It encourages an increase in the current account deficit, the dollar being the reserve currency of the world, and causes huge foreign indebtedness. It reflects a philosophy of instant gratification that says, live for the pleasures of today and have future generations pay the bills.

Two final points to remember: whether or not people can keep what they earn is first a moral issue, and second an economic issue. Tax cuts should never be referred to as a "cost to government." Tax cuts should be much bigger and come much sooner for everyone.

Remember, the real issue is total spending by government. Yet this issue is ignored or politicized by both sides of the aisle here in Congress. The political discussion about whether to cut taxes has avoided the real issue and instead has degenerated into charges of class and party warfare, with both sides lusting for power. Of course, the great issue for the ages, namely, what is the proper role for government in a constitutional republic, is totally ignored. Yet another question remains: Are the American people determined they still wish to have a constitutional Republic?

□ 1930

#### DISSENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, to publicly disagree with the President in wartime is seen by some as being somehow un-American. However, such dissent in this country has a long and distinguished heritage. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison protested John Adams' undeclared war against France. Madison in turn presided over a war so unpopular that it caused the New England States to consider secession. Abraham Lincoln and John Quincy Adams also criticized President James Polk's war on Mexico; and Theodore Roosevelt harshly criticized President Woodrow Wilson's handling of World War I.

Efforts to stifle criticism of the President and his administration during war also have a long history in this country. The Sedition Act of 1798 led to the arrest of many who criticized the Adams administration. A new Sedition Act was passed and enforced during World War I. It was not until 1964 that the Supreme Court effectively eliminated the crime of sedition in the United States and reaffirmed the constitutional right of free expression.

But my own recent experience and the experience of others who opposed military action against Iraq demonstrates that there are still many who believe freedom of speech should be curtailed when American troops go into battle. Respected elected officials have been lambasted for criticizing President Bush's foreign policy failures. Musical groups have been boycotted for making their anti-war feelings known. A screening of Bull Durham at the Baseball Hall of Fame was cancelled because two of its stars are outspoken peace advocates.

When Lincoln was challenged to defend his dissent in 1848, he explained that the Founding Fathers' decision to give war-making powers to Congress was primarily influenced by a long history of oppressive kings involving their peoples in wars under the pretense that it was for the public good. "But your view," Lincoln argued to his correspondent, "destroys the whole matter and places our President where kings have always stood."

Lincoln saw a great peril in the contention that the President should be the sole judge of the necessity to invade another country. He wrote, "Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary . . . and you allow him to make war at his pleasure."

Theodore Roosevelt had strong views on the need to speak out in wartime. Regarding the Sedition Act of 1918, Roosevelt wrote, "To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but it is morally treasonable to the American public." In that one eloquent sentence, Roosevelt neatly summed up the point

that needs to be made. When we disagree with the President and his administration during a war, we have not merely a right but a responsibility to publicly air those disagreements. Accepting that responsibility is imperative for the survival of the Republic as we know it. Without it the checks and balances of our separated system of government would be lost. The suppression of dissent in wartime would provide an unscrupulous or overzealous President with additional motivation to wage war. Senator Robert LaFollette said it best on a speech on the Senate floor in 1917. "It is no answer . . . to say that when the war is over, the citizen may once more resume his rights and feel some security in his liberty and passion. . . . If every preparation for war can be made the excuse for destroying free speech and a free press . . . then we may well despair of ever again finding ourselves for a long period in a state of peace."

LaFollette was not un-American nor were Abraham Lincoln or Theodore Roosevelt. They were patriots in the true sense of the word as are Michael Moore and Susan Sarandon and the Dixie Chicks. Patriotism is defined as "love for or devotion to one's country." Our country is not one President or one administration or one military action or even one flag. It is a place where we are free to openly disagree with our President and his decisions. That is what our country stands for. That is the principle to which we are devoted, and that is what we love.

The most recent ostensible reason we went to war to remove Saddam's regime was to bring this principle to Iraq. Would we have any credibility as freedom preachers if there were no public disagreement in our own home? Vocal displays of dissent during war do not hurt the cause of democracy and freedom. On the contrary, they provide a shining example for those parts of the world that are not yet free. Let us continue to show the world what it is like to live in a country where one can protest against its leaders without fear of reprisal. Let us continue to speak out. Let us continue to be true patriots.

#### THE OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. BASS. Madam Speaker, 4 days ago New Hampshire lost an old friend. It went unnoticed probably between 2 a.m. in the morning on Saturday. The Old Man of the Mountain collapsed and fell a thousand feet off the face of Canon Mountain, and I know New Hampshire mourns the loss of this great icon as if it were a friend. We all got to know the Old Man of the Mountain very well. We take it and took it very seriously. I remember as a child driving up through Franconia Notch and always stopping to see the Old Man

because it was really an extraordinary landmark. As recently as a month and a half ago, I drove down through Franconia Notch with my two children, ages nine and eleven, and we stopped for a moment just to take a look at it and get a quick photograph. Indeed, it was an extraordinary symbol of our State.

I have to say, however, that its loss was not totally unexpected. As long ago as 1880, people began to notice that there was some cracking and slipping beginning on this face, and it has continued to deteriorate over the years, and there have been organizations and groups who formed over the years to try to preserve it, but ultimately the day came when this 10,000-year-old rock formation which consists of over seven different ledges together to create this allusion of a face finally perished.

What does this loss mean for my State of New Hampshire? As I said a minute ago, the Old Man of the Mountain was indeed an icon for New Hampshire; yet it meant something different to each and every one of us. To some it was a tourist attraction, an important part of the local economy. As I said a minute ago, it was a childhood memory for me and my children and countless millions of other people not only from New Hampshire but all over the country. And most importantly, perhaps it is a symbol of what New Hampshire is all about and what New Hampshire has been for the last 200 years.

Indeed, those of us from New Hampshire take this symbol very seriously. The Old Man of the Mountain is on every single road sign of New Hampshire, every single license plate in the State. Highway tokens have the Old Man's face on it. The U.S. commemorative quarter for New Hampshire has the Old Man on it and the postage stamp which was created a couple of decades ago commemorating the Old Man of the Mountain.

I want to quote Daniel Webster, if I could, who served in Congress from New Hampshire over 200 years ago. He once wrote of the Old Man: "In the mountains of New Hampshire, God almighty has hung out a sign to show that he makes men."

We will all miss the Old Man of the Mountain. He is gone. But like any loss, his symbol and his memory will live on and New Hampshire will be a greater and stronger State as a result.

#### THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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, budgeting is about choices, whether they are a working family or the Federal Government. Working families know far too well that they cannot afford everything. They often must decide between making a mortgage payment or taking a family vacation or

between paying for health insurance or buying a new car. Their decisions reveal their priorities. It is more important to have a safe home for their families and to know that they can take their children to the doctor if they get sick. Parents routinely forego luxuries in order to ensure their children are safe and secure. The future of their children is clearly a top priority.

Just like working families, the Federal Government has limited resources, and just like working families, the decisions we make about how to use our limited resources say a great deal about our priorities. The tax package presented by the Republican leadership once again reveals what we have known for a long, long while: Working families are not their priority. When push comes to shove and difficult decisions are made under the Republican leadership, working families get the short end of the stick each and every time.

The message Republicans are sending with their tax package is clear: If one is wealthy, if one is heavily invested, they deserve a huge amount of permanent tax relief. If one is a working parent with a child, forget it. Not only will their tax cut be much, much less if they get one at all, it will be temporary. The \$1,000 per child tax credit will be lowered in the year 2006 to \$700, proving once again that families are not a priority.

The message from Republican leaders is clear: Working families are not their priority. I say that is a very bad policy. These are the toughest fiscal times that our States have seen in decades, and working families are suffering the consequences. As States are forced to tighten their belts and make cuts, teachers are losing their jobs and children are being taught in overcrowded classrooms. State health insurance programs now cover fewer children and are not providing as many services, and in many States families must now meet stricter eligibility requirements to enroll in State childcare programs, and all of this is done so the Republicans can give our Nation's wealthiest a big tax cut.

But the fact is we have a choice. We can help States meet these shortfalls or we can give tax breaks we cannot afford to the wealthiest people in this country, people who are actually not particularly feeling the pain of these bad times. The Republican message is inescapable. The rich are more important. If one is among the more than 1 million unemployed workers in this country who have exhausted unemployment benefits, this administration is saying you are certainly not a priority. Instead of extending benefits which would help care for families and immediately stimulate the economy for those who are out of work and out of their unemployment benefits, it is more important to put a little extra cash in the pockets of investors in the hopes they eventually will invest this extra money back into the economy.

Republicans may on occasion say they care about American families, but their actions expose their feelings. When offered the choice between making the rich a little bit richer or helping working families make their lives a little easier, Republicans pick the wealthy every time.

Madam Speaker, the budget process often forces us to make tough decisions, but if one asks me, the choices being made today are not difficult ones. Helping families so that they can do the best to make ends meet or enriching the wealthiest who do not even need our fiscal help is a no-brainer. In the same way that parents put the needs of their children over frivolous luxuries, it is time to adopt fiscal policies for this Nation that prove that we have our Nation's priorities in order, and that means, Madam Speaker, we need to work for hard-working families.

□ 1945

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

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

#### THE HIGHER COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about the issue of the higher cost of prescription drugs in the United States.

The gentlewoman who just preceded me who was talking about tax relief, I think I agree with some of the points she raised. When we talk about tax cuts, what we are really talking about is allowing people to keep more of what they earn. In soft economic times, I happen to believe it makes sense to allow people to keep more of what they earn.

As you see on this chart, which you can find on my Web site, we start by saying if we want to allow Americans to keep and spend over \$600 billion during the next 10 years. Here is a good place to start. It has got a picture of prescription drug capsules here.

The next page says, "That's right. According to the CBO," that is the Congressional Budget Office, "American seniors will spend over \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years on prescription drugs."

This is a conservative estimate. We are going to show you a chart in a minute that says that we could save 35 percent by allowing free markets to work. Thirty-five percent of \$1.8 trillion translates to \$630 billion.

Let me show you this chart. This is not my chart. I have a number of inde-

pendent experts around the country that have been working on this a lot longer than I have, they are a lot smarter than I am, but they have actually done some of the comparisons in terms of what we as Americans pay for prescription drugs compared to the rest of the world.

This is a chart by a group called the Life Extension Foundation out of Florida. They have been studying this for more than a decade. Here are some of the figures in terms of the prices we pay versus what Canadian consumers pay and what European consumers pay for the same drugs.

Let us look at the top right here. We have Augmentin. In the United States, a 30-day supply sells for about \$55.50. That same drug in Canada, made in the same plant under the same FDA approval, sells for \$12. In Europe it sells for \$8.75.

Cipro. We learned a lot about Cipro last year when we had anthrax here in the Capitol building. It is made by a German drug company called Bayer; we usually call it Bayer, Bayer aspirin. Cipro in the United States sells for \$87.99 for a 30-day supply. That same drug in Canada sells for \$53.55. Over in Germany it sells for \$40.75.

My father takes a drug called Coumadin. Here in the United States the average price for a 30-day supply of Coumadin is \$64.88. That same drug, again made under the same FDA approval in the same FDA-approved plant, sells in Canada for \$24.94. Over in Europe the average price is \$15.80.

Madam Speaker, as you look at this list, it just becomes very, very aggravating, when you see how much we pay. Glucophage, an amazing drug we sell here in the United States, the average price, according to the Life Extension Foundation, the average price in the United States, the average price, is \$124 here. The average price in Canada for the same drug, same dosage, is \$26.47. Over in Europe the same drug sells for \$22. Glucophage.

A couple of weeks ago I and one of my staffers were in Germany. We had the opportunity to actually do some shopping of our own. We bought a drug called Tamoxifen. It is amazing in terms of being one of the most amazing drugs we have developed in the United States.

Let me just talk about the drug itself, because it was developed largely with American taxpayers' money. Tamoxifen is the most effective drug against women's breast cancer that we have developed, but the American taxpayers paid for most of the research costs.

This drug in the United States at a pharmacy here in Washington, D.C. for a 3-month supply just like this sells for about \$360. In Munich, Germany, we bought it a week and a half ago for \$59.05, the same drug.

Now, some people would say shame on the pharmaceutical industry; but I have to say shame on us, because we have allowed this environment to be

created. It is not shame on them, because they are only exploiting a market opportunity that we have allowed them. The answer is open markets.

Many years ago President Ronald Reagan said that markets are more powerful than armies.

My time has expired, but I will be back in coming nights to talk about this issue and how Members can help solve this problem.

#### AN OVERVIEW ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, we of the Public Broadcasting Caucus are pleased to share with our colleagues this evening some very good news from the world of public broadcasting. The Overseas Press Club has presented NPR with the 2002 Lowell Thomas Award for the series "The Mideast: A Century of Conflict." This groundbreaking seven-part series, which aired on NPR's Morning Edition last fall, tells the history of the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians.

Veteran NPR News correspondent Mike Shuster researched, reported, and chronicled this in-depth series on the key moments in the history of the struggle between the two peoples. It covered the early Zionist movement during the turn of the 20th Century and traced the intensifying conflict between Jews and Palestinians during the years of the British mandate, leading up to David Ben-Gurion's announcement of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

The Mideast: A Century of Conflict," also explored the events that led up to the Six-Day War, the Yom Kippur War, the first Intifada, and the Oslo Peace Process. It concluded with investigations on the reason why the Oslo Peace Process collapsed and how and why the second Intifada started.

Kevin Klose, NPR's president and CEO, put it best when he said, "This series tells the history of the confrontation using radio to bring the views of leading historians of the region to air, documenting the deep and conflicting roots of today's Middle East. The series touches on the beliefs and emotions that motivate both sides."

Madam Speaker, it was no surprise when the Peabody Awards were recently announced for excellence in television and radio; public broadcasting was honored with one-third of those over-30 awards. This is part of why one in seven adults listens to public radio by tuning into more than 700 stations which carry NPR programming. Each week, over 20 million Americans listen to NPR, an audience that exceeds the top 35 U.S. daily newspapers combined.

When we consider this figure, along with 100 million people who watch public television each week, we see the

profound reach of public broadcasting stations. They connect people with their local community, their Nation, and their world in a way that no other outlet can or does.

The caliber of public broadcasting is unmatched by any other programming. Public radio and public television provide valuable commercial-free educational, informational, and cultural programming for communities all across America.

But it is not just an addition; it is not just an add-on and a frill. Many communities rely on public broadcasting stations as their only source of news and information. Some even use the public broadcasting system for day-to-day or emergency communications, such as AMBER Alerts and severe weather detection. As we work to improve our hometown security, Federal funding for these services is increasingly important.

Sadly, the future is cloudy. Nationally, while 41 States have public broadcasting operations, the source of the State support, which averages \$7 million a year, is in jeopardy. Given the current times of economic slowdown and State budget crises, many stations are facing severe financial cuts.

I am sad to say in my home State of Oregon, which faces one of the Nation's worst budget deficits, our State is considering eliminating funding for Oregon Public Broadcasting altogether. Even though only 6 percent of that \$33 million budget for the last 2 years comes from State funding, slightly more than \$2 million, right now the loss of any of that funding is compounded by the recession and the squeeze on corporate and individual donors.

Oregon is not alone in its public broadcasting cuts. Minnesota's Governor has recommended a 25 to 35 percent reduction in its public broadcasting budget. But there are some States that are standing firm. I was pleased to note that Nebraska, for example, reaffirmed its commitment to public broadcasting. Despite a 14 percent shortfall in its biannual budget, it will maintain its yearly State funding of approximately \$8 million.

Madam Speaker, we are all in this together: the Federal and State governments, our listeners, viewers and private sector donors. This is all the more reason for us to keep our commitment to public broadcasting. If we do not, many of the award-winning programs, like the one I just mentioned, "The Mideast: A Century of Conflict," will be at risk. All of us need to do our part, whether elected officials or individual listeners, to support this critical national resource.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2004 THROUGH 2013

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates established by H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004. The authority to make these adjustments is derived from Sections 421 and 507 of H. Con. Res. 95 (H. Rept. 108-71).

As enacted, H.R. 1559, a bill making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, contains changes in new budget authority, outlays and revenues that differ from those assumed in the budget resolution. For fiscal year 2003, the supplemental provides \$4,432,000,000 in budget authority, \$3,745,000,000 in outlays, and \$2,000,000 in revenues above the amounts assumed in H. Con. Res. 95. The supplemental also provides \$215,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$332,000,000 in additional outlays for fiscal year 2004; over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, it provides an additional \$888,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,406,000,000 in outlays over the amounts assumed in the resolution.

Under section 421 of the resolution, the Chairman of the Budget Committees are authorized to adjust the budget resolution to reflect the differences between the levels assumed in the budget resolution for the supplemental and the levels provided in the enacted bill. The adjusted levels of budget authority and outlays in the functional levels for net interest (900) and allowances (920) are as follows:

NET INTEREST (900)

Fiscal year 2003: \$240,203,000,000 in new budget authority and \$240,203,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2004: \$259,528,000,000 in new budget authority and \$259,528,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: \$310,822,000,000 in new budget authority and \$310,822,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: \$352,463,000,000 in new budget authority and \$352,463,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: \$380,846,000,000 in new budget authority and \$380,846,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: \$405,947,000,000 in new budget authority and \$405,947,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: \$429,867,000,000 in new budget authority and \$429,867,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: \$450,997,000,000 in new budget authority and \$450,997,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: \$473,746,000,000 in new budget authority and \$473,746,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: \$496,401,000,000 in new budget authority and \$496,401,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: \$514,926,000,000 in new budget authority and \$514,926,000,000 in outlays.

ALLOWANCES (920)

Fiscal year 2003: \$79,190,000,000 in new budget authority and \$42,024,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2004: -\$7,406,000,000 in new budget authority and \$22,678,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: -\$6,366,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,921,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: -\$7,151,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$5,581,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: -\$8,835,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$8,666,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: -\$9,875,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$9,873,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: -\$11,476,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$9,922,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: -\$12,860,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$10,864,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: -\$16,396,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$12,653,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: -\$21,444,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$15,691,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: -\$25,608,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$19,171,000,000 in outlays.

The changes in the functional levels cause changes in the budgetary aggregates. Accordingly, I also modify the budgetary aggregates and revenues for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 to the following levels:

BUDGET AUTHORITY, OUTLAYS, AND REVENUES

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,867,072,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,819,167,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,303,113,000,000 in revenues.

The amount by which revenues should be reduced, fiscal year 2003: \$56,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,861,333,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,884,280,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,990,603,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,981,995,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: \$2,122,725,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,089,892,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,233,213,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,190,978,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,349,256,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,307,637,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,454,814,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,420,227,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,555,986,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,528,260,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,669,845,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,651,603,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,754,409,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,724,337,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,875,544,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,855,914,000,000 in outlays.

## DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET)

Fiscal year 2003: \$516,054,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$558,828,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$488,120,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$432,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$400,727,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$405,793,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$366,465,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$360,323,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$381,063,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$314,765,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$301,929,000,000.

## DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,750,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$7,388,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$7,982,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$8,540,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$9,069,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,608,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$10,109,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,608,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$11,132,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,596,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$12,048,000,000,000.

## DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,921,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$4,303,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$4,604,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$4,835,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$5,013,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,175,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,278,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$5,356,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$5,435,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$5,432,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$5,402,000,000,000.

These changes in the budget resolution also affect the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations. The 302(a) allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$844,986,000,000 in new budget authority and \$846,706,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003. For fiscal year 2004, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee is \$784,675,000,000 in new budget authority and \$861,084,000,000 in outlays.

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

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

## THE REAL AMERICAN AGENDA IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this evening I would like to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Toronto Star written by the editorial page's editor emeritus, Haroon Siddiqui. The focus of this article is looking at the United States and our role in the Middle East and Central Asia. Though I cannot read the entire editorial tonight, I thought it had some excellent observations that are important for the American people to hear. It is often helpful to have a country from the outside looking at us,

rather than us looking out at the world.

Mr. Siddiqui writes that a superpower like the United States would find it somewhat easy to defeat an incidental power like Iraq, but to do so not only for its publicly stated reasons, fighting terrorism, liberating Iraq and triggering a domino effect of democratization of the Middle East.

But, he observes, the real American agenda is now only becoming clearer. The conquest of Iraq, he says, is enabling a new Pax Americana, the exertion of American power. That goes well beyond control of oil, though that surely remains a central enterprise.

He points out that America is pulling out of traditional bases of allies like Saudi Arabia and Turkey, and probably doing so because of the rising conservative backlash in those countries to our very presence. He mentions that U.S. relations with Egypt have been placed upon the back burner; Egypt, of course, being the most populace Islamic and Arab country.

It is no accident that the three nations, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt, are the region's most populous, but that America's newest partners are some of the most thinly populated, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, all as well tightly controlled monarchies.

People are a problem for America, he observes in the Arab and Muslim world. They are bristling with anti-Americanism, principally over the Israeli-Palestinian dispute, which remains unresolved.

He points out that the pullout just announced by the Bush administration of 10,000 U.S. troops from a Saudi air base was long overdue, but it so embarrassed the ruling House of Saud, which had to place it very far away from public view at a remote base in the desert.

I would point out in a way I was very disappointed that the Bush administration announced this current withdrawal so quickly, because Osama bin Laden has been given a victory. Osama bin Laden on 9-11 said to us that he wanted the infidels out of Saudi Arabia, and, among others, he was referring to U.S. troops based on Saudi soil. Why did we have to give him that victory? I think that helps to ripen terrorism globally.

The article goes on to say that the kingdom with the world's largest oil reserves, Saudi Arabia, and the highest output, will lose clout as America now controls the second largest reserves in the world in Iraq. And he states that America now has a vise grip on the region with 14 new post-9-11 bases, from eastern Europe, through Iraq, the Persian Gulf, Pakistan and Afghanistan, to the two Central Asian republics of Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.

□ 2000

The singular feature of all those new allies, he says, is that they are weak states. Most are undemocratic, if not repressive. So America is replicating

its failed model of using unrepresentative regimes to suppress people, but doing it on new turf. He says this short-term gain, therefore, of victory in Iraq may come at the expense of long-term pain and rising terrorism, as he sees America determined to install its own puppet regime in Baghdad with the majority Shiites being shunted aside.

He then comments on the Bush administration quietly cozying up to a most notorious terrorist group, the leftist Mujahideen-e-Khalq in Iraq, and he questions why would the Bush administration even want to do that, a terrorist group that killed Americans when we were having difficulties in Iran.

Taken together, he says, these American moves bear an uncanny resemblance to the British colonial enterprise of nearly a century ago which is still being paid by the people there. As America confronts this new world in the Middle East and Central Asia, it is worth reading Mr. Siddiqui's very perceptive comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## HONORING THE SONGWRITING TEAM OF HOLLAND-DOZIER-HOLLAND

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I take the well to celebrate one of the great music writing teams in contemporary writing history, and that is the fabulous legendary song writing team of Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier and Edward Holland, who wrote frequently with the Berry Gordy Motown group creating the enduring Motown sound that is still being heard in this country and all over the world.

I am happy to point out that these three great songwriters, all from Detroit, Michigan, will be honored by the Broadcast Music Incorporated, BMI, on May 13 with the ICON Award which is reserved for songwriters who have been unique and had indelible influences on generations of music makers. They will receive this award at the 51st Annual BMI Awards Dinner in Beverly Hills, California, and its president and CEO, Ms. Frances Preston, will present the award.

I am happy to tell you that I have had the honor of watching this great musical system of Berry Gordy and his family and these writers develop over the years. How interesting to now turn back only a little while ago to find that the Hollands had to go to church

and Mr. Dozier did too, and they could not go to the movies on Sunday until they had gone to church. They could not do anything else for the rest of the week if they had not gone to church. And in their home the only music that was allowed was gospel and classical and sometimes Billy Eckstein or Sarah Vaughan or Nat King Cole. And so these youngsters on the west side and east side of Detroit where they went to school, some of them met and knew Aretha Franklin, who was then singing in her father's, the late Reverend C.L. Franklin, church on Linwood Avenue already at the tender age of 9 years old, and they came out of this great family tradition.

Mr. Dozier's grandmother, Mrs. Melvina Watson, was the choir director at the Spiritual Israel Church Pentecostal; and when he was in junior high school he had formed the vocal group, The Romeos, five young men who had a recording contract with Atlantic; and then they went to Gwen Gordy, Berry Gordy's sister, Anna Records, and opened up their career and furthered it there. Then Gwen Gordy went with her brother Berry Gordy and they formed the Motown sound.

It is just so wonderful to recall how all these artists began, where their first writing was for Jackie Wilson, where they wrote this song, Reet Petite. And then they began to develop, Robert Bateman will always be remembered for bringing them together. It was wonderful. They finally began to click.

Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the contributions of the legendary songwriting team of Holland-Dozier-Holland, consisting of Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier, and Edward Holland to American cultural history. The songwriting trio, known as H-D-H, wrote most of the songs that created the enduring American "Motown Sound." On May 13, 2003, they will be honored with the 2003 BMI (Broadcast Music, Inc.) ICON Award, which is reserved for songwriters who have been unique and indelible influences on generations of music makers. H-D-H will receive this award at the 51st annual BMI Pop Awards dinner in Beverly Hills, California. BMI President & CEO Frances W. Preston will present the award. Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier, and Eddie Holland are most deserving of this award, which puts them in the company of Chuck Berry, James Brown, Bo Diddley, and Little Richard.

In 1959, a young African American Detroit, Berry Gordy, Jr., formed a company named Motown (an abbreviation of Detroit's "Motor City" moniker). Holland-Dozier-Holland were architects of the instantly recognizable and barrier breaking "Sound of Young America," of Motown, creating the songs that turned a fledgling Detroit record company and its associated songwriters, producers, and artists, into an industry groundbreaker and powerhouse.

As songwriters and producers, H-D-H created such classics as "Reach Out, I'll Be There," "Stop in the Name of Love," "Where Did Our Love Go?" "Heat Wave," "Baby Love," "Baby I Need Your Lovin'," "How Sweet It Is to Be Loved By You," and dozens more hits. The blend of sweet and joyful lyrics

and complex musical stylings defined an era. Their music is on the soundtrack of countless films and television programs and has become the soundtrack for many American lives. Their innovative style and sound inspired millions of musicians throughout the world to improve and enhance their craft.

The astonishing success of H-D-H and Motown was a symbol of change in the United States in the 1960's, and the end of an era when access to an audience was limited by either opportunities or racial prejudice.

The sales of Holland-Dozier-Holland's music run into hundreds of millions of dollars and include some of the most widely-recognized pop songs in the world. Holland-Dozier-Holland songs also have accrued nearly 100 million airplays on United States radio and television stations. The songwriting team is a member of the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame, the Songwriters Hall of Fame, and winner of The Rhythm and Blues Foundation's 2002 Pioneer Award.

I commend BMI, an American performing rights organization that represents more than 300,000 songwriters, composers, and publishers, in all genres of music, for honoring Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier and Eddie Holland. I also congratulate the three worthy recipients.

#### SINKING AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, now that we have achieved victory in Iraq, the country will refocus its attention on matters close to home, specifically our sinking economy. Unfortunately, victory in war does not necessarily translate into success in domestic economy. In terms of the economy, we have been treated to a cycle of failure by this administration and my Republican colleagues. Consider that unemployment is now up to 6 percent. There has been a decline in the length of the workweek, meaning more people are working fewer hours. Manufacturing workers were hurt particularly hard last month. Factory payrolls fell by 95,000, the 33rd consecutive monthly decline.

According to Jerry Jasinowski, President of the National Association of Manufacturers, "Since July 2000 manufacturing has lost 2.2 million jobs, among the highest-skilled, best-paying jobs in our economy."

My colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), goes on to point out that "Republican claimed that both the 2001 and the 2002 tax cuts would create jobs but they were wrong. Instead, 2.7 million private sector jobs have vanished since this administration took office a little over 2 years ago."

The fact is tax cuts have yielded 400 to \$500 billion deficits. They did not revive a sluggish economy, and what you are hearing now is, well, this is because of the war. Not true. Forty-three percent of our current deficits are directly attributable to these tax cuts. A small percentage is attributable to the war.

We have only authorized \$80 billion and the rest comes from the sluggish economy which the 2001 tax cuts failed to revive.

What happened in 2001 was that we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and my Republican colleagues came down here and said, We have got to give this money back to the American taxpayer so we can invigorate our economy. That did not happen. What we have instead is a projection over the next 10 years of a \$2 trillion deficit and we are going to borrow over \$500 billion this year.

The fact of the matter is the tax cut policy of the Republicans has not worked. We have seen this plan before.

Now we turn to what I call the Bush/Thomas model. I think it is a model of tax unfairness and ineffective economic policy. An analysis of the Thomas proposal by the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center concluded that his plan would be even more tilted to the affluent than Bush's original plan. According to the Brookings analysis, the average tax cut offered by the Thomas proposal for households earning more than a million dollars would be almost \$43,000 in tax cuts in 2003, compared with the administration's original proposal to give the very wealthy only 27,000. Then on top of that the top 5 percent of households, the top 5 percent of American households would receive 64 percent of the Bush dividend proposal, but under the Thomas proposal that they will roll out this week that same 5 percent would get 75 percent of the tax benefits.

There is something fundamentally unfair about that.

Now, in truth the middle class will only get about \$100 to \$200 in so-called tax relief; but the administration says, oh, no, a family earning about \$40,000 would get about \$1,000. That is called flimflamming the numbers. What they do is they take the average, reflecting the fact that the millionaire will get \$43,000 annually. That is how they get that false average.

In addition, we find that the Thomas plan does not create jobs. There is broad consensus among economists that reducing dividend taxes does not create jobs. In fact, economy.com has rated this as one of the least effective options in terms of stimulating growth. Bill Dudley, chief U.S. economist for Goldman Sachs has pointed out, "Rather than shoe-horning the dividend plan in, they should be trying to shoe-horn in the most amount of economic stimulus."

When the Democrats talk about our plan, we will talk about that, stimulus, putting money into the pockets of the middle class, helping our States' government so we can really stimulate this economy.

Finally, the Republicans tell us, well, look at our child care tax credit. We do not just care about the wealthy. It is very interesting when you look closely because although the tax breaks for the very wealthy are permanent, the

child care tax credit that they would have you focus on is really only temporary, and by the year 2006 they will actually be losing money on the child care tax credit.

So what we see in conclusion is a very flawed tax proposal tilted very much to the wealthy. They give us a solution to the American economy that says if you cut taxes on the wealthy, you will improve the economy by creating jobs. It did not work in 2001. It did not work in 2002. It is as Yogi Berra said, *deja vu* all over again.

I think we ought to reject this approach to tax policy and adopt a progressive Democratic approach that really works for middle class and working Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THOMAS TAX PLAN BAD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I did not think it was possible but the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) came up with a worse tax plan than the one President Bush proposed earlier this year. And, of course, we all know that that tax proposal was marked up. It was considered this afternoon in the Committee on Ways and Means. And I want to say that neither the President's plan nor the House Republican plan that was marked up by the Committee on Ways and Means today will jump-start the economy, which is our major concern.

We have now been through several months, even several years of an economic downturn and something has to be done to jump-start the economy, but nothing that the Republicans in the House nor the President have proposed will accomplish that.

Madam Speaker, since the President took office, more than 2.7 million private sector jobs have been lost, the worst record in 40 years. Any tax cuts passed by Congress should be fair, fast acting and fiscally responsible; but the Republicans plan fails all three of those tests. The Republican plan does not create jobs. It irresponsibly piles up debt, risks Social Security to make room for tax cuts for the wealthy, and continues the failed economic policies responsible for the current economic downturn.

□ 2015

Madam Speaker, the Republican tax plan, in my opinion, is simply unfair.

The wealthiest Americans will fare better under the Republican tax plan in the President's plan, while middle-class Americans, Americans with annual incomes between \$30,000 and \$100,000, will actually receive less under the Republican plan than they would have under the President's plan, which also was not good.

According to a report released this week on the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, households with incomes of more than \$1 million per year would receive an average tax cut this year of \$105,600 under the House Republican plan, and that is \$15,000 more than they would have received under the President's proposal. Contrast those benefits with the middle fifth of households that would receive an average tax cut of \$218 under the Thomas plan, slightly less than under the Bush plan.

Let me reiterate, a millionaire under the Republican plan would see a tax benefit of more than \$105,000; but an average American making between \$40,000 and \$50,000 would receive a cut of only \$456.

I just do not understand what my Republican colleagues and what the House Republican leadership have in mind with this rush once again to pass another tax cut that will primarily benefit wealthy Americans and corporate interests and really do nothing to turn the economy around. We frankly cannot take another 6 months or another year of this economic downturn; and to suggest that somehow we are going to do something like this that helps a few people who happen to be wealthy, as opposed to helping the general populace or doing something to create jobs, makes absolutely no sense to me.

We understand that coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means today this is likely to be on the floor sometime the end of this week. We probably would vote for it on this Friday, and I would hope that there would be an opportunity to bring up Democratic alternatives and to bring up amendments under an open rule so we have an opportunity to make some changes in what the Republican leadership has proposed. I doubt it, but I think we have to continue to agitate and say that other options must be considered.

Again, as I said, Madam Speaker, at a time when we should be doing everything possible to jump-start the economy, the Republican solution centers around tax cuts on dividends, stock dividends and capital gains, two cuts that are, again, a target towards the wealthiest Americans and according to economists will not create new jobs. If my colleagues think about it, if we think about eliminating the tax on stock dividends, what does that accomplish? What makes anyone on the Republican side think that by eliminating a tax on stock dividends that the money saved by the people who would benefit from that would necessarily be reinvested in the economy, in the cre-

ation of new jobs, in the creation of a new means of production? We have no guarantee of that, and there is nothing in our economic policy that suggests that those kinds of tax cuts or elimination of stock dividends or capital gains are actually going to force or create a situation where money is reinvested in the economy, that is, creates more jobs.

My colleagues do not have to take my word for it. There are about 400 economists earlier this year who put out a statement that basically said that "the tax cut plan proposed by President Bush is not the answer to the problem." They concluded that "the permanent dividend tax cut, in particular, is not credible as a short-term stimulus."

We need things that are going to create jobs immediately, money pumped into infrastructure, into economic development projects, not money that is just going to go to pay for people who have invested in the stock market and somehow that that is going to be turned around. There is no guarantee this is going to create jobs in the short term.

Madam Speaker, like the Bush economic blueprint, the House GOP plan is also fiscally irresponsible because of the debt that it would create, saddling our children with debt and hurting long-term economic growth. This is such a reversal of fortunes from what we witnessed before the President took office under the Clinton administration. The economy was growing; we had a surplus rather than a deficit. Now, under the Bush economic plan, the deficits keep mounting.

When the Bush administration came into office, there was a projected \$5.6 trillion 10-year surplus. With this latest tax package that we will probably vote on this Friday, coupled with the huge tax cut in 2001, Republicans will produce a record \$1.4 trillion deficit over the next 10 years. That is a \$7 trillion reversal in our country's fortunes from where we were 2 years ago in the last few months of the Clinton administration.

What I really do not understand is how the Republican leadership in the House is no longer concerned about deficits. Madam Speaker, I remember a time when I was first elected here, which is about 15 years ago now, when I would come down on the House floor to do a Special Order, and there were a group of Republican Congressmen who used to bring a huge clock. It was about the length of the entire desk here where the House Clerks are sitting behind me; and it was so heavy and long they used to have the pages to come down and carry the digital clock. It recorded the level and the increase in the deficit on a daily basis or a weekly basis and the Republicans would harangue about the problem that the Nation faced because of increasing deficits. Where is that concern? It does not seem to exist anymore on the GOP side.

Back in 1995, the current majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), voiced concern that President Clinton's economic policies would lead to record deficits; and he said, "By the year 2002, we can have a Federal Government with a balanced budget or we can continue down the present path towards fiscal catastrophe." Well, the gentleman was correct about a fiscal catastrophe, but he was wrong about the culprit. He has nobody but himself and President Bush to blame for the fiscal crisis our Federal Government now faces, and they are trying to make it worse with this latest round of tax cuts.

Today, based on the tax proposal this House will debate, as I said, this Friday, it is clear that House Republicans have changed their tune. No longer are skyrocketing deficits a priority. This, despite the fact that Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan last week agreed that huge deficits will threaten economic growth. He stated before a committee in the Congress, "If, through tax cuts, you get significant increases in deficits which induce a rise in long-term interest rates, you will be significantly undercutting the benefits that would be achieved from the tax cuts." That is Alan Greenspan whom the President says that he is going to reappoint, basically saying that the President and the Republican economic policies are essentially going to continue the economic downturn over several years, not just now but down the road.

So how can they talk about how these tax cuts will have a long-term benefit to the economy? They will not. They will only make the economy worse.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the Republican tax plan is full of what I call gimmicks designed to hide the true cost to taxpayers. In fact, the only proposals within the Republican plan that are beneficial to America's middle class, the marriage penalty relief and the child tax credit, which the previous speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), mentioned, both of these would expire after 2005. So, of course, nobody thinks that would actually happen. Instead, the Republicans would come back and extend the benefits which then would raise the total cost of the package to at least \$760 billion through 2013 over the next 10 years. Again, The Washington Post editorial page called these gimmicks tax-cut trickery this morning.

So the Republican leadership is not even being honest about what they are doing here. They are suggesting that they are going to put these important proposals, the marriage penalty relief and the child tax credit, into play. They do not even talk about the economic costs of them over the 10-year period that we are discussing.

I want to say, and I have to say because I think it is always important that the party in opposition put forward proposals that are different if we

do not like what the majority is proposing, the Democrats have proposed a true economic stimulus plan that meets the test of being fair, fast acting, and fiscally responsible. Our plan would create one million jobs this year, provide an extension of unemployment benefits to millions of Americans still looking for jobs, provide tax relief to small businesses to invest in new equipment this year, and provide assistance to cash-strapped States and municipalities.

Let me explain that. As we all know, in my home State of New Jersey as an example, States have to balance their budgets. They cannot go into debt the way the Federal Government does; and so State after State and Governor after Governor, both Democrats and Republicans, across the country over the last few years, because of the economic downturn, have had to make major cuts in their expenditures because they cannot go into debt. What is the consequence of that? Less and less money is being spent by State and local governments in real terms, and so what that means is that there is not the money out there to generate the jobs and the economic opportunities.

Rather than giving the wealthy a big tax cut, what the Federal Government should do is take some of that money and give it back to the States so that they are not withdrawing funding and programs and infrastructure needs from the economy that cause the economy to contract. That is what the Democrats would like to do, take some money from the Federal Government, give it back to the States so that they do not have to cut their budgets the way that many of them have had to do, which has a negative impact on the economy.

Of course, our Republican colleagues do not want to do that. They just want to cut taxes; and again, that problem really goes to wealthy individuals and corporate interests. Not only are the Republicans attempting to trick the American people with their tax proposal, but unfortunately, President Bush is also misleading Americans all over this country as to why we may once again face budget deficits as far as the eye can see.

I talked about the budget deficits. They are primarily caused by Republican economic policies, i.e., the tax cuts; but again, Mr. Bush says the opposite. The President says the opposite. This morning's Washington Post editorial says, "And then there's Mr. Bush, peddling a woefully incomplete account of how the deficit got so large and dangerously misstating the impact of his tax cut on future deficits."

According to The Washington Post editorial again, "In Arkansas yesterday, for example, Mr. Bush attributed the deficit to the recession and to his decision to send troops into combat. Both have indeed helped turn projected surpluses into deficits. But so has something Mr. Bush's account omits," and that is his first \$1.35 trillion dollar, that is trillion dollar, tax cut.

The Post editorial continues, and says, "Budget Director Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. Acknowledged to the House Budget Committee in February that next year's deficit would be more than one-third smaller were it not for the tax cut. So the President is simply misleading Americans when he says we have a budget deficit either because of the war or because of a recession. The fact of the matter is the tax cuts he enacted into law in 2001 are the main reason for the deficits we now face. And, unfortunately, those deficits will get even larger if we enact either the President's plan or the House Republican plan."

Madam Speaker, over the last 2 weeks, the President has toured the country trying to sell his tax cuts, even as congressional Republicans disagree among themselves about the proposal, delaying action to fix an economy that is badly broke. As the President has tried to convince the country of the merits of his proposal, it is clear that his rhetoric bears little resemblance to the facts.

Let me give my colleagues a couple of the best example of the President's rhetoric as opposed to the reality of the situation. In Canton, Ohio, on April 24, President Bush claimed that "ending the double-taxation of dividends, according to many economists, will help the stock market. If getting rid of the double taxation of dividends increases the markets, it will be good for millions of investors all across America. It will be good for our economy. And it will reduce the cost of capital, which means jobs." That was the President's statement.

Based on those statements by the President, a likely listener in Canton, Ohio, understandably would have believed the tax cuts on dividends would lead to jobs; but, again, the President's claim, in my opinion, is simply false. In fact, economists have rated this proposal the one with the least bang for the buck in jump-starting the economy of all the different proposals that have come forward in the Congress.

For example, Song Won Sohn, chief economist with the Wells Fargo Company said, "A dividend tax change is not the best tool to stimulate the economy. Joe Sixpack does not have much in the way of dividends."

Similarly, according to Jonathan Rauch of the Brookings Institute, "Few economists believe that the gains from efficiency would offset more than a small portion of the increases in deficits."

The President continues to talk about stock dividends as the way to solve the economic problem. There is no economist who will tell us that.

During this same Canton, Ohio, speech, the President blasted away at those of us who have rightly called his tax proposal a tax cut for the wealthy.

Madam Speaker, I have said it many times tonight, and I will continue to say that that is what it is; but the President told the crowd in Canton,

“So when you hear politicians say it’s a tax cut for the rich, they’re talking about you. Tax relief is good for the average citizen.” Well, the President says that, and it is nice rhetoric; but it is not the facts.

Under the Bush plan, 25 percent of families with children would get no tax cut at all and half of all Americans would get less than \$100. Half of all Americans, Madam Speaker, would get less than \$100. In contrast, as I said earlier, under the President’s plan, someone making \$1 million a year would get a tax cut of \$90,222.

□ 2030

Overall, just 17 percent of the Bush tax cut goes to families with income under \$75,000. If we want to talk about fuzzy math, how can the President say all Americans are going to benefit when only 17 percent of the tax cuts go to the overwhelming majority of Americans who make under \$75,000 a year. This is not something that is going to help the little guy, it just helps the wealthy; and primarily it helps the very wealthy, the millionaires and even billionaires.

Madam Speaker, as the President continues to travel around the country in an attempt to rally support for a failed tax proposal, critical education, health care and homeland security programs are being ignored by this administration and the Republican Congress.

The point I want to make tonight is that not only are these tax proposals not going to help the economy, but at the same time critical programs, education, health care, homeland security, the very things that President Bush has talked about, are being ignored and neglected by this administration.

Let me talk about that. Both the President and the House Republican tax plans crowd out investments important to long term economic growth, like education, training, research and transportation.

Let me talk about the education initiative. When President Bush signed the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act in 2002, and I commend the President for it, it was a great piece of legislation that we passed on a bipartisan basis. But the President promised to write a healthy check for education. We cannot just pass a bill like that and not provide the funding that is going to provide for the education programs mentioned in the bill. So he said he was going to write a healthy check for education and it was nice words, but 1 year later when the President had an opportunity to support historic education reform with funding in his 2004 budget, he widened what I call his credibility gap by providing \$9.7 billion less than what was promised in the No Child Left Behind Act.

I am hearing from educators and teachers that are telling me that they are not getting the funding promised under the No Child Left Behind Act. The President signs this legislation, he says he will leave no child behind, but

he does not back it up with the appropriate funding. It is a credibility gap, essentially.

The simple fact is that the President cannot provide the critical education funds because of his huge tax cut for the wealthy. It is not that he does not want to do it, it is because he has this huge tax cut and once that is put in place, there is no money to fund the No Child Left Behind initiative. The simple fact is that the tax cut precludes that.

Now we see thousands of teachers being given pink slips in California, class sizes increasing all over the country, and one of the Teachers of the Year in South Carolina was being laid off because the State was forced to make cuts in education. If we really want to make something or do something that is going to be meaningful in terms of education reform, we have to fully fund No Child Left Behind so it can become a reality; but that is not possible if the Republicans are successful on Friday and in the next few weeks in passing their tax bill and sending it off and the President signs it.

Madam Speaker, let me also talk about another need that the President talked about in his State of the Union Address in January, and that is health care. The President and the Republicans will also find it difficult to address the health care needs of seniors and low-income Americans if they are successful in passing their tax proposal.

President Bush’s rhetoric was in high gear earlier this year when he stated in his State of the Union Address that “Medicare is the binding commitment of a caring society.” Unfortunately, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, that bond would break if the President’s intentions of turning Medicare into a voucher program became reality. Again, I do not know whether or not he is ideologically driven in saying he wants to make Medicare into a voucher program.

The bottom line is because of deep tax cuts he may not have a choice because there is not the money to fund the Medicare program in the traditional way. That is why I believe the President is seeking a voucher-type system for Medicare because he will not be able to afford to continue to fund Medicare in the traditional way with these tax cuts.

The President has a so-called modernization proposal for Medicare that would limit the government’s responsibility and shift costs to seniors under this voucher plan, ending the Medicare program seniors have depended on for 25 years. I know he is going to say it is not ending Medicare, it is a different type of Medicare. It is more of a privatization. If it is not the type of Medicare that seniors have traditionally relied upon where they have guaranteed benefits, then it is not really Medicare any more.

Furthermore, President Bush’s prescription drug proposal goes so far as

to essentially force seniors into HMOs if they want to receive prescription drug coverage. There again it is a form of privatization. He is saying if you want to get prescription drugs as part of your Medicare program, you have to purchase private insurance, move to some type of system where you are provided prescription drugs, but you have to go under an HMO.

Again, not traditional Medicare. If seniors have to be forced into an HMO in order to get prescription drug coverage, then I think the promise of Medicare that they would be able to choose their own doctor, be able to choose their own hospital, goes unfulfilled. Again, these are all cost-cutting measures that become necessary because the money is not there as a result of tax cuts.

Madam Speaker, I do not think when it comes to Medicare there is really any credibility any more on the part of the President when he continues to advocate these kinds of changes. He is essentially dismantling the Medicare program the way we know it by giving the impressions to seniors that he is somehow strengthening it.

The other thing that these tax cuts will have a devastating impact on is Medicaid which unlike Medicare which is mostly for seniors, Medicaid is the health care program for low-income Americans. I think the huge tax cuts will make it almost impossible for Republicans to address the health care needs of seniors under Medicaid and low-income people in general under Medicaid.

Earlier this year the President proposed a plan to shift responsibility of the Medicaid program to the States in the form of block grants. Again, this is a recipe for disaster considering most States now face severe fiscal problems. The President would cap the amount of Federal funding States receive from Medicaid, requiring States to either spend more out of their own budgets or face the difficult decision of dropping beneficiaries or cutting social services. So what we are going to see is fewer and fewer people becoming eligible for Medicaid and the needs of low income individuals not being met.

Madam Speaker, the Federal Government I do not think can ignore its responsibility to these 44 million low income children, adults and elderly Americans who depend on Medicaid services. The President and Republicans would not have to propose again these changes in Medicaid, this block granting and ultimately reduction in funds to the States if they scrapped their current tax proposal that primarily benefits the wealthiest Americans. Maybe in the case of Medicaid it is the worst juxtaposition because it is giving tax cuts to primarily wealthy people and taking away health care in many cases for the most needy under Medicaid.

Madam Speaker, at a time when our economy needs a true jolt to reverse American’s fears of losing their jobs,

the Republican leadership once again plans to give a huge tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, and the plan that they put forth offers very little to families and middle class Americans and instead sacks them with a huge deficit, a deficit that risks the future of Social Security and Medicare and means likely future interest rate increases.

I know I sound like doomsday today, but frankly for 2 years we have seen the Republican economic policies in effect, and I think it is only fair to say they have been a failure. The economy has gotten worse. More jobs have been lost. The debt continues to pile up. So there is no reason to believe that these continued economic policies that are basically in the form of tax cuts are going to do anything more than continue the economic downturn.

Democrats, on the other hand, have proposed what I consider a true economic stimulus plan that is fair, fast acting and fiscally responsible. Again what we are essentially doing is putting more money in people's pockets, and we are giving money back to the States so they can spend the money on infrastructure, health care, education, and other needs. It would mean that more jobs would be created because there would be transportation projects and infrastructure projects in general that would need new people to go on the job.

Also, we say that we want to provide an extension of unemployment benefits to millions of Americans still looking for jobs and tax relief to small businesses to invest in new equipment. We would target tax relief for small businesses, assuming that they turn it around and they spend it for new means of production, new opportunities, new jobs.

Most important, we would provide assistance to cash-strapped States and municipalities which right now because of the fact that they are contracting their spending are also, I think, contributing to the economic downturn.

I know that many of my colleagues on the Democratic side have talked about and contrasted what the Republicans would like to do and what we would like to do on the economy, and we will continue to talk about that this week as we move forward with this Republican proposal that is supposed to come up for a vote on Friday.

But I would just say to anyone who says why would I believe the Democratic proposal is better, I would say look at what has happened over the last 2 years under the President and the Republican proposal. It has not worked. I frankly do not think we can go on another 2 years with the same failed economic policies. It is time to do something different, and we should be looking at some of the Democratic alternatives instead of just saying we are going to continue with the Republican tax cut.

#### ENCOURAGING INDIA-PAKISTAN TALKS

Madam Speaker, I did want to change the subject for just another 5 minutes tonight before I end this Special Order, and go to another topic which relates to foreign affairs because I do think that what we have been witnessing the last few days, particularly over the weekend with regard to the potential for bilateral talks between India and Pakistan, is a very optimistic development in an area of the world which has a great potential for future war.

Anything the United States can do to encourage negotiations, talks, between India and Pakistan I think are very important, and this is an opportune time for the Bush administration and the Congress to urge support for those kinds of negotiations and eventual peaceful settlement.

Madam Speaker, I was encouraged over the last week by Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee's leadership in seeking peace with Pakistan. Vajpayee's efforts to reinstate full Indo-Pakistani diplomatic relations and to restore cross-border transportation between the two countries exemplifies his willingness and commitment to finding a permanent peace settlement within South Asia.

I would like to express my praise for the Prime Minister's recent brave steps, given the incessant cross-border terrorism in Kashmir. In the past, India was insistent that an end to cross-border terrorism had to occur prior to any renewal of talks between India and Pakistan. Unfortunately, any efforts by President Musharraf of Pakistan to curb terrorism in Kashmir have been superficial and Pakistani militant violence in Kashmir has continued to no end.

I would urge President Bush and Secretary of State Powell to pressure Musharraf to end the cross-border terrorism into Kashmir and India in general. I would also like to note, even as we have had these murders take place by terrorists in Kashmir, this has been aggravated by the fact that the Taliban continue to find safe refuge in many of the border towns of Pakistan near Afghanistan. The U.S. worked so hard to remove the Taliban from power in Afghanistan, and to learn that Taliban members continue to receive moral and financial support from parties within the Pakistani government, including the Pakistani military, is by far the greatest hypocrisy.

Again, the Bush administration must do more to pressure President Musharraf to end support within Pakistan for the Taliban.

Madam Speaker, I also wanted to say that I am very encouraged by the fact that Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage is visiting both Prime Minister Vajpayee and Prime Minister of Pakistan Jamali, and I know he is going to recognize the recent positive developments from both sides. Again, the United States must do whatever it can to encourage negotiations between India and Pakistan that would lead to long-term peace in South Asia.

Madam Speaker, Congress also can play a role in encouraging the peaceful settlement of disputes between India and Pakistan.

□ 2045

I have at least two proposals that I would like to mention in that regard. First with bilateral dialogue already resuming, the Congress should provide funding for projects that cross the two countries' borders. This could be done as an effort to provide confidence-building measures for the future stability of this region. For example, we could include infrastructure projects, such as roads, railroads or water projects that cross the borders between Pakistan and India. Second, Madam Speaker, if negotiations lead to a settlement that is agreed upon by both India and Pakistan, the Congress should provide funding in the form of a peace dividend that could bring the two countries together and all of South Asia together as one economic union.

Madam Speaker, the peace dividend could take the form of economic development projects that tie the two countries together for trade and other business purposes. I think the United States itself would also benefit from increased trade with all of South Asia.

So, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to say in conclusion, I look forward to successful dialogue between India and Pakistan and ultimately peace in South Asia. Again, I think that the President, the administration and Congress must together encourage negotiations and not lose what in effect is a golden opportunity, not let this pass by because we might not see another opportunity like this where these two nations, both of which have nuclear weapons, seem to be willing to move forward toward peaceful negotiations. Let us not let the opportunity slip by. Let us do whatever we can to encourage the two countries to get together and ultimately bring peace to the South Asian area.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to bring to the attention of the body an addition to the list of homeland heroes that we periodically bring forward to focus a little attention on because these folks face an incredible task. They have been waging a battle on their own property and their open land for quite a number of years now. I simply believe that it is deserving of our attention.

Tonight I want to talk about Larry and Toni Vance. These are homeland heroes residing near Douglas, Arizona. Larry Vance lives only one mile from the Arizona border and three miles

west of the border town and port of entry of Douglas. Larry is the son of a legal Mexican immigrant. He and his wife Toni have lived in the area for 29 years. The Vance family has seen many changes in that nearly 30 years that they have lived a mile from the border.

Among the changes they have witnessed is the character of the illegal aliens crossing their land. In the 1970s and 1980s, they told us when we were visiting down there not too long ago, there were very few drug smugglers, that most groups coming across their land were small, three or four or five people; that they were polite and often asked to stop for directions or ask for water. The Vances were friendly and accommodating. There were periods during the late 1970s and early 80s when bandits posed a real danger to the residents along the border and burglaries were common. The Vance home was burglarized twice. There was a crack-down on the border crossings, the border patrol was beefed up; and the crime problem was brought under control.

But in the mid-1990s they noticed that groups of illegal trespassers were getting larger and that there were many more of them. By 1997, the Vance family was seeing a daily pattern of 20 groups of 20 or more people passing through at all hours of the day and night.

I want to say here that this is something that we heard over and over again while we were visiting around the Douglas, Arizona, area, that is, that something is changing, something is happening in the character of the immigrants coming through, illegal immigration into this country. It is certainly not a pleasant thing for the people who live in the area. The groups were not only men. Now they were women and children and also sometimes pregnant women and elderly people. Groups were coming through their property so close to the house that they could not sleep at night because the dogs would bark so much. In fact, the dogs literally would lose their voice, become hoarse, I suppose, is one way to say it, from barking night after night.

In September of 1999, his two dogs were poisoned, the Vances' two dogs were poisoned. One of them eventually died. Bandits from across the border preyed on helpless illegal aliens that were crossing. They robbed them, they beat them, they raped them. The screams of the victims were often heard across the desert at night. The Vances had to install a high chain link fence around their house and wrought iron window guards. Such measures were unheard of in rural Arizona until the mid-1990s, and it is traceable to the rising crime from illegal aliens crossing their land.

The illegal aliens often asked for rides to Tucson or Phoenix, and on several occasions Larry Vance was offered \$300 to \$500 to transport people to Phoenix. The Vances' horses often escaped and had to be chased the next

day because their fences were knocked down or cut. Three years ago, he quit trying to keep horses; it became so difficult and expensive to keep the fences repaired. Larry Vance used to keep water troughs filled for the wildlife, but he cannot do that anymore because the illegal aliens constantly break the water lines. They do not merely drink the water. That would be okay. In fact, oftentimes I have seen where these ranchers along the border would actually put out cups, hang a cup along the water trough and along the water well for people to use themselves. But unfortunately they do not just take the cup and drink, now they destroy the water lines. The environmental damage to their land is tremendous. Trash is left in huge heaps and left everywhere. Both cattle and wildlife are killed because they eat the plastic bags and other trash. Traffic accidents caused by illegal aliens chasing other vehicles or just careening into a ditch have become regular occurrences. Many local residents have been killed by crashing with rampaging cars and trucks driven by illegal aliens fleeing across the border. A young father of two children was killed in such an accident just a short time ago.

In the weeks and months immediately following the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, there was a dramatic decrease in the flow of illegal aliens across the land. The ports of entry at Nogales, Naco, and Douglas had been strengthened and more border patrol agents added to the ranks. But by mid-2002, the flow had resumed. The groups merely went around the ports of entry and came across the miles of unguarded fence that opened onto private lands. I often talk about the very peculiar and ironic view that we had from a helicopter when we were flying over this area, this area he is talking about here, Nogales, where there is a port of entry and there are large numbers of cars all lined up trying to come into the United States at that port of entry. We have got all these guards stationed where the cars come through, at these ports of entry; but you can, of course, see for many miles there, because it is just flat desert land, you can fly for a couple of miles either side of that port of entry and see people coming across at their will, driving cars right through the desert, walking across; but, of course, right there at the port of entry, they are checking IDs and all that sort of thing. It is ironic to say the least. It is a microcosmic look, if you ask me, of the entire system, of the entire problem.

The groups merely went around the ports of entry, as I say. By late 2002, the drug smuggling had risen dramatically and marijuana-laden trucks crossed the border regularly in the area far away from the ports of entry but right near Larry and Toni Vance's home. During December of 2002 alone, there were 41 reported incidents of drug seizures. We can only imagine how many trucks got through the border

patrol and made it to Phoenix and Los Angeles and elsewhere.

The lives of ranchers like Larry Vance and his wife, Toni, have been radically altered in the last 10 years because their government, their own government, has failed to protect them and their property from the invasion across their land. Invasion is exactly what this is. That is the proper term to use to describe what is happening on the border and what these people along the border are facing. As I say, the Vances are just one of many couples, one of many families that we visited, that we became acquainted with just a month or two ago down on that border. I determined at that point in time that it would be important to bring their story to this body and to the Nation, because frankly, Madam Speaker, not many people know about them. Not many people beyond their immediate family and the immediate area around Douglas know of the Vances. But they should know, because these people are truly in a war zone. They are fighting a war and they feel like they have been abandoned, abandoned by their own government. And, in fact, they have.

I could not bring them good news when I was down there. I could not say to them, not to worry, the government is going to come to your rescue. The Federal Government is going to do what it promises it should do and what it promises to do for every American citizen, and, that is, to protect their lives and property. I wish I could tell them that. I cannot do that in all candor. I cannot say that. Because this government has chosen to ignore the Vances, ignore all of the families, all of the homeland heroes that I have brought to the attention of the body over the last several weeks.

They have chosen to ignore the millions of people in this country who plead with us, plead with Members of Congress, to do something about illegal immigration, to try to stem the flow of illegal immigration into the country, to try to get a hold of this problem. Not to slam the door to people, not because anyone is doing this or is concerned about the issue from racial lines or any of the ugly aspects of the immigration debate. Certainly there are people like that on both sides out there. You can go to the Web sites on both sides of this issue and find people who are racially motivated. I guarantee you it is on both sides of this debate. Racism can be a factor. It is not what motivates people like the Vances, I say, Mr. Vance himself, the son of a legal Mexican immigrant. He is devoted to his land. He is devoted to the country. He is devoted to the United States of America. He believes in the United States. He believes in the rule of law. All he asks is that the law be enforced, especially in his area, that his property be protected from this invading force. Is that too much to ask, I wonder. I do not think so. I only wish the public officials of this Nation had as much courage as the Vance family.

We need to follow their example and take our responsibilities seriously. We need to gain control of our borders so citizens like the Vances can live their lives free of this constant threat.

Madam Speaker, I am going to go on to another aspect of this discussion, beyond the Vances and the homeland heroes; and I want to talk a little bit about one other aspect of this whole immigration dilemma that we face. We have tried to break down the discussion of the immigration debate into several component parts. Over the weeks I have come to the floor of the House with a discussion of one particular part of the immigration dilemma or debate. I have talked about the national security implications of open borders, of the porous borders that we now have, the fact that people can and do come into this country at their will, some of them to do great harm to the United States. It is to the credit of many of our agencies, many of the law enforcement agencies that are devoted to the task of protecting America that some events have not already occurred with people who have come into this country illegally for the purpose, as I say, of doing us great harm.

But we have a significant national security problem because of open borders and because of our unwillingness as a Nation to actually secure our own borders. That was the first night that I focused on that. And then we talked about the cost to the Nation, the infrastructural costs to the Nation of massive immigration. I talked about the fact that there are hospitals all over the Southwest that are going broke. I talked about the fact that hundreds of billions of dollars are being expended by citizens of this country through the health care process in order to provide health care for illegal immigrants into the country. Sometimes situations occur where we actually see ambulances coming up to the ports of entry carrying people who need help and they are waved into the United States, go to a hospital, obtain the help they need, and then they go back to Mexico and, of course, pay no bills. I talked about the infrastructural costs of housing, of schools, of highways, of imprisonment. Upwards of 25 percent of the population in Federal prisons are noncitizens. There is an enormous cost to massive immigration into the country, both legal and illegal.

People suggest that it is of benefit to the country to have massive immigration and that it is economically beneficial, that these people pay a lot of taxes and that they do jobs no one else would do and so our economy prospers. In reality, the costs of immigration are far greater than the contributions in terms of either the labor or certainly the taxes that are paid. Another thing that I talked about was the damage to the environment. I mentioned a little bit in my discussion here tonight about the Vances, the amount of trash that spoils the land in this area, where

people are coming through by the hundreds of thousands, in fact, over time millions of people crossing the border on foot, sometimes, of course, in an automobile simply driving off the road. We could see it time and time again where people drove off the road right into the middle of the desert, right off the desert floor. Those tracks will not go away for generations. Not in my lifetime, anyway.

□ 2100

We can see from the air where the footpaths go on and on and on, and they spread out like cobwebs over the land where people come walking across that land, thousands of feet, hundreds of thousands of feet, millions of feet, plodding the ground in areas that are quite pristine, and they destroy the environment. They affect the migration pattern of animals in the area, of endangered species. They deposit trash in huge amounts. They congest in these areas called pickup sites where people dispose of the trash they have been carrying to get ready to be picked up by the next form of transportation, usually a car or a truck, moving them into the interior of the United States, into a city in the United States away from the rural areas where they are congregated. But where they congregate in these pickup sites, the trash problem is enormous. I am going to talk about a little bit later and show something that we found in one of these trash sites, but there is that aspect, the environmental damage to the land.

I talked last week about the culture, about the danger immigration, massive immigration, poses to the culture and especially because it is connected, massive immigration is connected unfortunately with something happening in the United States. The sort of cult of multiculturalism is the best way to describe what is going on here, where we teach our children that there is nothing unique about the United States or Western civilization and if there is anything unique, it is uniquely bad, that there are no aspects of Western civilization worth mimicking. We tell our children they should not say the Pledge of Allegiance in schools. We ban it. We attempt to erase any sort of semblance of patriotism, any commitment to the idea of America, and I talked about the implications of such a phenomenon, the very serious implications of this combination of massive immigration into the country, both legal and illegal, combined with the cult of multiculturalism.

Tonight I want to talk about another aspect, and that aspect is the attack on citizenship that is represented by massive immigration into this country, especially illegal immigration into the country. It is an attack on the concept of citizenship. That is, I suppose, the best way for me to describe my concern.

There have been several very good books written about this and a lot of articles. I will quote liberally from one

book in particular by Georgie Anne Geyer. It is called "Americans No More," and, Mr. Speaker, I certainly suggest it to anyone who wants an interesting read on this particular subject. We start out talking about the importance of citizenship. Does it matter? Does the idea of citizenship matter? Is it an important element of our society, of any society? Citizenship is more than just banding together for protection against enemies. Citizenship particularly as it has evolved throughout the Western world, as Georgie Anne said, is the unique and ennobling story of the post-feudal modern relationship of the individual human to the state, of the state to the individual, and of the human being to his fellow man. It is a dignified component of respect, responsibility, even friendship and love.

Citizenship I think is important. We are seeing everywhere, however, that the whole concept of citizenship is being attacked, as I say. It is being eroded by a variety of actions, by a variety of different kinds of laws that are being adopted, by States and localities and certainly even by this body. It is being eroded by the aggressive actions of other nations.

I want to talk about one specific aspect of this. There is today a card that is being used by several governments distributed to their nationals, to their citizens and their nationals, and it is the Matricular Consular. It is a card given out by foreign governments to their people. It is an identification card that is provided by a foreign government to their nationals. Interestingly, this is not a new phenomenon. It has been available for a long time, but only recently have governments realized that it can be used, this process, this idea of the Matricular Consular, can be used as a way of avoiding and getting around the roadblock that the Congress of the United States has presented in the form of an opposition to amnesty, to amnesty for all people living here who came in illegally, which is an assault on citizenship as far as I am concerned.

The desire of many people, Mr. Speaker, the desire of many people even in this Congress, is to eventually eliminate anything that would distinguish a citizen of the country from someone who is not a citizen of the country. How do we do that? We do that by providing all of the benefits of citizenship to people who are simply here, to people who are residents, and pretty soon it simply becomes impossible to tell the difference. We just do not know, and that is the desired goal of many people, foreign governments, and the Government of Mexico is heavily involved in this process, certainly Members of the Congress of the United States. Even others I think in the administration want to push this concept that there is nothing that really should distinguish an American citizen from someone who is here "illegally" or someone who is here legally but not a

citizen. Eventually they want to reach a point where there is nothing that distinguishes any of those people from each other, and so one of the things that has happened is that they begin to push this Matricular Consular.

Here is how it works. It is interesting, I have to give them credit. This was a smart move on the part of the Government of Mexico now being followed by four or five others, most recently Honduras. As I say, every government is allowed to do whatever they want, to provide their citizens with whatever kind of I.D., identification, that they want; but only recently have they found out that this can be used to advance the whole concept of amnesty or of the elimination of a distinguishment of citizenship. By giving the Matricular Consular, this I.D. card, to all of their nationals now living in the United States illegally, and frankly that is the only type of person that would actually need the Matricular Consular or this card from the Government of Mexico and four or five other South American/Central American countries. The only people in this country, I repeat, the only people in this country who need a form of identification provided by some other country is someone living here illegally because if they are here legally they have a document that the United States gave them, a visa, green card, or a passport given to one by the Nation that they came from. But they have something. They have an I.D. given to them, and that is a legitimate form of identification. They do not need the Matricular Consular, but they are now handing them out in the thousands. One can go to almost every Mexican consulate in America, the 40 some Mexican consulates in America, and one will usually see a line of people sometimes around the block. This is just recently happening because they are now handing out the cards to people who are here illegally; then the Mexican consulate goes out and lobbies States, cities, police departments, school districts, lobbies them to get them to accept the Matricular Consular for the provision of services as identification, and they have been quite successful. Scores of cities have done this. Many, maybe in the hundreds, police departments have agreed to accept the Matricular Consular as an identification. We have already, by the way, arrested people carrying multiple Matricular Consulars with their picture on it but with a whole bunch of different names, easily forged of course, but the desire is to establish a different immigration policy from the one that the United States Federal Government runs and to get a local government, a city or a State, to accept these cards. It is happening all over.

In my own State of Colorado, four cities, Denver, Colorado Springs, Glendale, and Boulder all agreed to accept the Matricular Consular for the provision of services and for identification

purposes. Police departments all said yes, sure, we will do it. Some of them, not knowing exactly what the implications of this were, looking at it in a very short-sighted way, saying we need something to identify these people, not realizing that once they use that, once they say that we have accepted this form of I.D. that is provided by a foreign government, they have immediately conferred status upon the person who has it, a status that that person does not deserve because that person is here illegally.

Colorado, to its credit, was the first State in the Nation, I think just a couple of days ago, I think no longer ago than last week, passed legislation to stop this thing, to say no entity of the State of Colorado, no city, no department in the State of Colorado could accept the Matricular Consular, or what I think the legislation was that they could not accept any card that was not issued by the Federal Government or by the State for purposes of identification.

I hope other States do this. I understand that there are at least two other States that are looking at this, and I certainly hope that that legislation will progress. I believe Iowa and Arizona are the other two States that are looking at this.

Banks are using these cards to allow people to open up bank accounts. Remember, if one is here illegally they do not have a true Social Security number. I always wonder, when the bank allows someone to open up an account using these Matricular Consular cards for identification purposes, whether or not they are actually listing the Social Security numbers because of course they cannot because they are here illegally. So what happens to the interest on that account? How does that get identified come income tax time?

This Matricular Consular is a tool that is being used, as I say, to acquire what they could not get through this Congress, and that is amnesty, and that is an attack on citizenship. It is part of the movement to eliminate the whole concept of citizenship. Mexico and the Mexican government, as I say, has tasked these consular officials, and we have tons of documentation to show where Mexican consular officials have gone out to lobby.

Let me ask the Members, Mr. Speaker, what do they think would happen if an American consular official would go to an official in the State of Chihuahua in Mexico and say, "Look, we need your help in allowing people from the United States to come down here and violate the law?"

□ 2115

We would like you to help us out. Would you please accept an ID given by our government? Even though people are here illegally in Mexico, we would like you, nonetheless, to accept our ID for all the services that might be rendered to an illegal American citizen living in Mexico."

What do you think would happen? First of all, the Mexican Government would throw you out on your ear. The Governor of Chihuahua is, by the way, now visiting, as I understand it, the Governor of Colorado to get him to be a little more lenient with regard to the immigration issues.

That is another interesting aspect of this. We see all this communication now between the Government of Mexico and State governments, this ongoing lobbying activity with States and localities, on immigration issues.

Immigration is supposed to be uniquely a Federal responsibility; yet because of the fact that they cannot achieve their goals through this body, they are taking and doing the next best thing. And they admit this. They have stated on many occasions, Mexican officials have stated quite publicly that their desire is to obtain amnesty for, obtain all of the benefits of citizenship, for the people who are living here illegally. Even though they cannot do it through this body, they will do it through things like the advancement of the Matricula Consular being accepted all over the place.

But as I say, what do you think would happen? First of all, the Mexican Government would demand an apology from the State Department for having an American consular official go down to Mexico, or any other country on the planet, and try to lobby them, lobby their local government leaders, to get them to help people violate the national law.

That is exactly what is happening here. Yet we have said nothing to the Government of Mexico. We have filed no protest. I brought this up to the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, in a hearing on the Committee on International Relations on which I sit, and he said he was concerned. He was concerned. He did say that. That is as far as it has gone.

I want the American people to know, Mr. Speaker, that apparently the policy of this government is to allow the law of the land to be eroded; and in order to erode the law of this land, they conspire, our own government conspires with foreign governments to help them lobby State and local communities to obtain what they cannot obtain through the Congress of the United States.

The California Assembly last Monday approved legislation that would allow legal and illegal immigrants from Mexico to obtain city and county services by displaying the identification card issued by the Mexican consulate. Under the terms of the legislation, these cards would enable illegal aliens to do everything from acquiring a marriage or business license, borrowing books from the public library, securing senior citizen or student discounts or public transportation, and on and on and on and on.

According to a recent news article, few of the 5 million undocumented Hispanic immigrants had bank accounts

because they lacked sufficient identification. In late 2001 that changed for Mexicans when banks began accepting an ID issued by Mexican consulates, the *Matricula Consular*. Almost 2 million Mexicans have already obtained the card, largely because it is a key into the banking system.

Some immigrants arrive with \$20,000 in cash, according to this article. Bank of America often sends staff out to ply those waiting for the *Matricula Consular* with brochures and coffee. The banks of the country are aiding and abetting people who are here violating the law in order to get them to be customers.

Interestingly, however, is that banks in Mexico do not recognize the *Matricula* as legal identification. It is far too easy to forge, for one thing.

The Dominican consulate is planning a move that it says they hope will ease some of the lives of some of the Dominican immigrants, because they are going to start issuing the card. They are going to start issuing *Matricula Consular*. With this ID, illegal immigrants would find it easier to open bank accounts, they say, and identify themselves to the police. There are tens of thousands of illegal Dominicans in New York City and Chicago alone, for example.

The longer the government waits to develop a coherent policy on immigration, the longer we postpone efforts to improve border security, the more frequently we will see thinly disguised attempts at policy-making like the *Matricula Consular* cards emerge.

That is certainly what is going to happen, because we do have a tendency to try to ignore this issue. In a way, I can understand why there is a desire to ignore it, because they are accomplishing their goals by ignoring it. By not dealing with it here, by this body refusing to deal with it, then I assure you, the people who support the concept of amnesty and the people who oppose the concept of citizenship will achieve their goals.

What else are we doing in this country to attack the whole concept of citizenship? Well, recently both the State legislatures in Virginia and Maryland passed legislation that would give in-state tuition to illegal immigrants; but they were met with vetoes, at least in Maryland. I do not know for sure about Virginia. Perhaps they have also vetoed the legislation.

In fact, what happened in Virginia is this, that they passed a bill to stop anyone from providing illegal immigrants with in-state tuition, and that bill was vetoed, it is true. Unfortunately, I should say, it is true. The issue has come to the State of Colorado also.

A few States, California, Texas, New York and Utah, have already granted in-state tuition to children of illegal immigrants, this in violation, by the way, of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act. It says specifically that

States cannot offer in-state tuition to illegal residents, unless they also offer it to all legal residents, regardless of what State they come from.

So, Mr. Speaker, a parent today paying out-of-state tuition prices for his or her daughter or son to go to school in California, Texas, New York or Utah, could, I believe, file a lawsuit on the basis of our 1996 Immigration Reform Act if California, Texas, New York, and Utah do not extend that same privilege to everybody. I am an American citizen, a citizen of the State of Colorado, a legal resident; but I cannot send my child to those four States and get in-state tuition.

Unless they approve it for everyone, then they should not approve it for anyone. That is the law of the land. That is the 1996 act that we passed. But these States are doing it. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anyone out there who is in fact paying out-of-state tuition for their kids in these places should think about this very seriously and consider the possibility that they may have some legal action against these States to regain the tuition that they have spent.

But this is another attack on the whole concept of citizenship. If in fact you can provide all of the services, all of the benefits, all of the things that the California legislation provides, cards that would enable illegal aliens to do everything, from acquiring marriage licenses, business licenses, borrowing books, securing senior citizen discounts, getting all kinds of social services, if you can do that, if you can send your child to school in any State in the Nation, or at least these four, and several others are proposing it, and get in-state tuition, if you can get driver's licenses, which are now being proposed for illegal immigrants, do you not see, there is little if anything left that distinguishes you from a person who is here legally.

If you can obtain all that by coming into the country illegally, then why in the world would you go through the brain damage and the expense of doing it the right way? Why would you spend the money or the time or the energy? You can get everything else, because, after a while, citizenship will not matter. It will be of no consequence. And that is the desired goal of the people who support this kind of State legislation and who refuse to take it up in this body.

Luckily, there are some Members of this body who have been steadfast in their opposition to this kind of malarkey. They have been steadfast supporters of immigration reform. They were laboring in this vineyard before I ever came to this body. One of them has joined me here this evening, my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER). I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take this opportunity to point out to my fellow colleagues and those who are listening in

on C-SPAN, as well as those reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the tremendous courage it takes for the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) to be leading this effort.

This is a thankless effort. The gentleman just suggested that when you add up these various different approaches of things that are going on that it is minimizing the importance of citizenship, and that perhaps this is being done by design.

Well, it is clear there is a coalition of a very powerful people in this country who do not really believe in the type of United States of America and the laws of the population we grew up with, but instead have more of a "global concept" and are willing to basically experiment with the rights, if not discard the rights, of American citizens in order to create this new dream.

These are powerful people. These are people who have attacked the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO). They are people that have great deals of financial resources and political power.

I personally am just rising tonight, when I saw the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) here again trying to be like Paul Revere and spreading the word and talking about the danger ahead of us, I wanted to come down here and let everyone know what a risk the gentleman is taking, that he is doing this at great personal expense.

The gentleman could be a "go-along, get-along" guy. Those of us who try to make waves here, I try to be very amicable and I know the gentleman from Colorado does as well. He has a wonderful laugh and smile. We try to be fun-loving, good people, with good hearts and of good will; but at the same time, we are having to tackle issues that mean life and death to the people of the United States. It means whether our people are going to have their children go to school or not, whether the standard of living of our people is going to decline.

Why do we have a situation where dramatically during the 1990s, there was such a huge increase in the GNP in our country, and, yes, the top 20 percent of our country did benefit, but the working people of this country, by and large, were kept behind? If you really trace it back, and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) has done this many times before, we have looked at the charts, illegal immigration, this overwhelming flood of illegal immigration in the 1990s dragged down the standard of living, dragged down any pressure for an increase in wages for the working people.

I know that I do not come from a wealthy family, and I am sure the gentleman from Colorado does not either. We identify with working people.

There is no doubt that in the Federal Government there are many people who come from the elite of our society. But our job is to watch out for the working people and the regular human beings who go off to fight the wars, and

go to work every day, and our good citizens by way of every race, of every ethnic group, of every religion. America, what we are so proud of, it is the fact we are a combination of the whole world; but we are working together, and because we have this love of liberty and justice and these ideals that keep us together.

That is why it is so ever-important to recognize that we are a unit, that Americans are a family; and if we have policies that are bringing in strangers, even though they may be very good strangers and very positive people, from the outside, but it is happening in such a magnitude as to prevent our people from sharing in this great prosperity that we had in the 1990s, keeping wages down, that it is wrong. It is a wrong thing.

Ordinary people are having their standard of living brought down by helping strangers. Our first and foremost job is to watch out for America and Americans and do what is right. Sometimes it takes a very courageous person to do that, and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) has demonstrated that time and again.

For those of you who do not know, the gentleman has made every hit list of every radical group, and other political groups, unfortunately. People that should know better have targeted the gentleman.

I am very proud of him tonight, and I hope all of you who are looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are seeing this on C-SPAN and the rest of the colleagues here will give Mr. TANCREDO his due.

I have my own Special Order later on tonight after the gentleman is done, but I thought I would make sure everyone understands what a great job the gentleman is doing for our country and for each of them.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I am flattered, and I am humbled by my colleague's kind words. I sincerely appreciate it. I have said this over and over again, because I know the gentleman feels this way, I know there are many other Members of the Congress who feel this way, and that is that massive immigration, combined with this sort of radical multiculturalism that permeates our society, this is so dangerous. It will not only determine what kind of a Nation we are in the future, that is to say divided, Balkanized, or united, it will determine whether we will be a Nation at all.

Those are the stakes that I think are on the table. Therefore, I feel compelled to come here night after night, to stand up in any venue I am allowed to, and talk about this issue. I cannot think of anything that has more of a potential detrimental impact on the Nation than this massive uncontrolled immigration, combined, as I say, with this cult of multiculturalism.

□ 2130

Because it does conspire to make, for instance, a severe and very, very dan-

gerous attack on citizenship itself, on the Nation itself. We talked about the various things that people are allowed to do now and that governments, State and local governments, are allowing to do who are living here illegally who are breaking our laws. And I mentioned that if you can come to the United States illegally, get your children educated for free, which you certainly can, K through 12, if you can now get your children educated at the state institution of higher education for in-state tuition, if you can obtain all the social services, all of benefits, if you can go to the hospital, get treatment for your ailments, get treatment for your children, get health care paid for, if you can use public housing get subsidized housing, if you can get all of those benefits, then there are very few things left that distinguish you as the citizen. One of those things is the ability and the right to vote. But guess what, this right to vote, this right to vote which we for a couple of centuries anyway held so dear, this right to vote is also being now threatened. And it is added, I should say, that right to vote is being added to the list of things that people can obtain here in the United States even if they are not citizens.

In 1991, Tacoma Park, Maryland, not far from here, voted to give non-U.S. citizens the right to vote in city elections. Several others by the way, several other cities around here have followed suit. Every time I say this people say no, that is impossible. That is not true. No, it is quite true. There are cities throughout the country, especially on the East Coast here, not too surprisingly I guess, that say if you are a resident of the city, simply a resident of the city, show us your utility bill, show us your driver's license, you can vote. Your citizenship will not be a question.

Now, there was a former state delegate in Maryland by the name of Thomas Mooney. He wrote an article in the Prince George's Journal. He was on the opposite side of this vote. He said, "Never have I heard of anything so ridiculous, so devoid of merit and so blatantly anti-American as the recent proposal to allow illegal aliens the opportunity to vote in city elections. If I went to Mexico or El Salvador I would not expect to be involved in their electoral process. I am an American citizen. My allegiance is to the United States. Voting is much more than supporting one candidate over another. It is a positive affirmation of our system of government. It is an act of involvement, a rite of passage for defining American citizenship. It is a vital piece of our common culture. It is under intense, strident attack by the Hate America First crowd. By allowing aliens to vote we demean that act which legitimizes our government and is one of the essential unifiers of our society."

Absolutely true. Now, Tacoma Park, as I say, was not the only one, has not been the only one who has ever done this. Even in the late 1960s a radical

move occurred in New York City where the decentralization of the New York City schools, all parents, legal or illegal residents, were given the right to vote in 32 community school board elections. In New York City citizens were voting not only in elections for school boards, but, interestingly, on policy boards that were in charge of distributing anti-poverty funds to community groups.

In Chicago not too long ago a television station there, WLS-TV, did a comprehensive investigation of illegal aliens and the vote. It was a 5-part series in the early 1980s. They found that illegal voting was rampant. People were questioned on air and asked about it and they all said, yeah, sure, I vote. Robert Baskin states, "Carlos is a citizen of Mexico, but he had no trouble registering to vote in Chicago."

In California there have been bills up before the state legislature to allow anyone to vote. Time and again we have seen where people have actually set up stalls and set up tables in parking areas in California especially that are frequented by people who are here illegally, day centers where people come to get jobs and things of that sort. They set up these tables to register illegal aliens in parking lots and then tell them how to vote. They complete absentee ballots by hundreds and thousands and give them to illegal aliens to sign them and send them in. They transport van loads of illegal aliens to multiple voting locations in various names. This has gone on for quite some time.

Again, when you add it to all of the factors, when you add it to all of the things that I have said people can obtain by simply being here and not necessarily being a citizen, you can see why there is concern, why there is great concern for what is happening to the United States of America.

Theodore Roosevelt said in his speech on true Americanism in 1894, "We have no room for any people who do not act and vote simply as Americans and as nothing else. We demand that all citizens shall have fair treatment in every way. They all alike shall have the rights guaranteed them. The mighty tide of immigration to our shores has brought in its train much of good and much of evil. And whether the good or evil shall predominate depends mainly on whether these newcomers do or do not throw themselves heartily into our national life, cease to be aliens and become Americans like the rest of us. But where immigrants or sons of immigrants do not heartily and in good faith throw in their lot with us, but cling to the speech, the customs, the ways of life, and the habits of thought of the nation which they have left, they hereby harm both themselves and us. If they remain alien elements, unassimilated, and with national interests separate from ours, they are mere obstructions to the current of our national life and get no good from it themselves, and they are who really suffer the most."

"It is an immense benefit to the immigrant to change him into an American citizen. To bear the name of American is to bear the most honorable title. From his own standpoint it is beyond question that the wise thing for the immigrant is to become thoroughly Americanized. Moreover, from our standpoint we have the right to demand it. We freely extend the hand of welcome and of good fellowship to every man no matter what his creed or birthplace who comes here honestly, intent on becoming a good United States citizen like the rest of us. But we have the right and it is our duty to demand that he indeed shall become so. Above all, the immigrant must learn to talk and think and be the United States."

Not too long ago I had an opportunity to have a breakfast meeting with a Bishop Gomez, Bishop of the Catholic Church in the Denver archdiocese. And he did not agree with my concerns about immigration and about what is happening in the country with the lack of interest in citizenship and the attack on citizenship. And he said to me, Congressman, I do not know why you are so concerned about this, he said. He said, Most of the people coming here from Mexico today do not want to be Americans. And I said, Well, of course, Bishop, that is exactly the problem, is that they do not want to be and, by and large, they are not coming to be, we are witnessing, by the way, something else. Even people who are here legally are choosing not to become citizens at a far higher rate than ever before. Two-thirds of the people living here legally but who are not citizens of the United States have chosen not to pursue the citizenship route. That is another new phenomenon. And, again, I guess I could say, why should they? What is the benefit of citizenship? Why should anybody go through it? Everything obtainable under citizenship can be obtained if you simply walk across these borders. It is a dangerous thing.

There is a celebration for the Hispanic community in the United States referred to as Cinco de Mayo. It was over the weekend. It is an enjoyable celebration many people attend and certainly a large number of Hispanics in Colorado attend and enjoy it. I was listening to a radio talk show and they were talking to several of the vendors on the street. I thought it was interesting the vendor who was doing the biggest interest at Cinco de Mayo in Denver, according to this radio program on National Public Radio so it certainly had to be accurate, right, but the stall that was doing the most business was the stall selling Mexican flags. And later on that evening I saw a short clip on television show Cinco de Mayo and they were, of course, waving thousands and thousands of flags. All Mexican flags. I did not see a single American flag there.

Now, there is every reason to be prideful in the country that you are

from. I certainly am proud of my Italian heritage. I do not wave the Italian flag on any particular holiday of Italy, and I certainly never would have thought of doing so. And if I did ever put out an Italian flag for some reason, I think I would put out an American flag next to it or above it to show my commitment and loyalty is to the United States. It is just a little thing. It is not a huge thing. You cannot draw a lot of conclusions from it. I thought it was an interesting thing that that was the one stall doing the most business and it was the prominently displayed flag during this celebration.

Why should anyone care? We encourage them not to in many ways, not to care about being an American, not to care about the fact that citizenship is a privilege, conferred upon people who have strived to come to the United States, overcome tremendous obstacles, devoted their lives in many cases to attaining that wonderful goal, being so excited when they were able to do so, when they were able to raise their hands and take that oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

Interestingly enough, now that oath, even the citizenship ceremony, the INS is letting individual groups, some religious groups, actually determining who will pass the test. They put out little brochures talking about how easy it is to pass the test, so that you do not have to worry anymore. They are not going to ask you any really tough questions. We will give you the tests in your own language. Doing everything possible to simply eliminate anything that is sort of a hardship to becoming an American citizen.

Well, I think anything that is given away is not valued. And I think that we should begin to be concerned about where we are going as a Nation, and how massive immigration combined with this multiculturalist phenomenon in the United States has the tendency to tear us apart and to do great damage to this country.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), when he stood up he talked about courage and that sort of thing to say these things, but really it is imperative that all of us address these issues.

I came across this, and I will just end with this. This is a speech given by Enoch Powell in England, 1968, on the issue of immigration. He said,

The supreme function of statesmanship is to provide against preventable evils. In seeking to do so it encounters obstacles which are deeply rooted in human nature. One is that by the very order of things such evils are not demonstrable until they have occurred. At each stage in their outset there is room for doubt, for dispute, whether they be real or imaginary. By the same token they attract little attention in comparison with current troubles which are both indisputable and pressing. Once the besetting temptation of all politics is to concern itself with the immediate present at the expense of the future. Above all, people are disposed to mistake predicting troubles for causing trouble,

and even for desiring trouble. "If only," they love to think, "if only people wouldn't talk about it, it probably wouldn't happen." Perhaps this habit goes back to the primitive belief that the word and the thing, the name and the object are identical. At all events, the discussion of future grave, with effort now avoidable, evils is probably the most unpopular and at the same time the most necessary occupation for the politician. Those who knowingly shirk it, deserve, and not infrequently receive, the curses of those who come after.

I choose to avoid that particular environment. I do not want to have to look back and think, I wonder how this all happened? I wonder what happened to the Nation that I knew? And I do not want to have to try to explain to my children and to my grandchildren that it happened on my watch and that I did nothing, I did absolutely nothing to prevent it.

□ 2145

I want to convince them that I tried my best and so I will come back to this well of the House and as long as I am able, on as many occasions as I possibly can, to discuss this topic and to try and get our colleagues and the American people, to get our colleagues to reflect the attitudes and the opinions of the American people, 70 percent of whom agree with everything we are saying here tonight who are asking our own government for help, like this family that I brought to my colleagues' attention earlier and like the millions of others who are seeking to deal with the massive immigration and the negative effects it has had on their lives.

The people of this country know there is something wrong. I do not think there is a bigger divide between what the people of this country want and what the government is willing to give them than it is on this immigration issue.

So we will do everything we can; and as I say, I certainly appreciate the efforts of those who have labored in this particular environment long before I came here, like my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), and others who I know have been sounding this alarm for a long time. I join them in that chorus, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

#### LESSONS LEARNED SINCE 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I thought that I would discuss some of the lessons learned since 9/11 and discuss some of the current events that we are seeing happen on a daily basis and put them into some historical perspective.

First of all, 9/11. Let us note that 9/11 was not an unavoidable natural occurrence. 9/11, an attack upon the United

States by an organized group of terrorists, happened because past American policies toward Afghanistan were wrong and because during the Clinton administration our general policy of weakness led our enemies to the conclusion that they could attack the United States of America and murder our people by the thousands and that there would not be the type of repercussions that they have had to endure since they did attack our country on 9/11.

I have spoken extensively about the past policies about Afghanistan which led to the establishment of a Taliban, an extremist Islamic state in Afghanistan, which then was used as a base of operations for a terrorist organization that was committed to attacking the United States of America and killing as many of us as possible.

I have also spoken in the past about 9/11 representing not only a mistake in policies but also a major, major screw-up on the part of America's intelligence organizations. 9/11, while the policies that we had as a country helped lead us to that situation, we should have at least been protected by our CIA, the FBI, and the national security administration. But what happened?

We were blind-sided. We were blind-sided not just in an attack that cost the lives of thousands of Americans, but we were attacked by an organization, the al Qaeda, which had already been declared the number one enemy of the United States and the number one target of our intelligence community. The number one target of America's intelligence community, a community made up of organizations: the CIA, the FBI, the NASA, DIA and many others. These people receive tens of billions of dollars a year in order to protect us; yet the number one target of American intelligence carried off an extremely complicated plot against the United States that spent tens of millions of dollars putting a minimum of 100, if not hundreds, of people in the field who must have known about this; yet they were able to carry it off and to bring down the Trade Towers in New York and killing 3,000 of our fellow Americans. Let me add, had this happened a half an hour later or an hour later, it would have been tens of thousands of Americans and not 3,000 Americans.

Let me just note that we have learned a lesson from 9/11. The CIA since 9/11, I am happy to report, has gone to great lengths to make up for their shortcomings prior to 9/11. The same with the FBI. The same with NASA. Apparently they learned the lesson.

I remember when I worked in the Reagan administration back in the 1980s; and in 1983, almost just about 20 years, a little more than 20 years ago, right as we speak, Ronald Reagan put America's military forces on alert and sent them to the island country of Grenada in the Caribbean, which was going through a turmoil when a radical group

of Communists took over that country. I remember that inside, that was a victory supposedly for the Cold War, and we did return democracy to Grenada; but the liberation of Grenada itself was a catastrophe.

All of our military forces found that they could not communicate with one another. Most of the casualties we suffered, and we suffered almost as many casualties in Grenada as we suffered in taking on Iraq and Afghanistan and Grenada was just a tiny little country, but most of the casualties in the liberation of Grenada were friendly fire casualties. Most of those who died in our military, it was because our own military people were not cooperating. They learned that lesson, I might add.

The leaders of our military took it to heart what they had seen and how embarrassed they were that they were not being serious about their job, and they reconfigured our national military; and today we have such a superb military, headed by, I might add, a man of vision and a decisive leader, Mr. Rumsfeld; and Secretary Rumsfeld and the leadership of our military have just given us one of the most profound military victories, one of the most astounding military victories in the history not only of the United States but of the world.

We took on, with very few casualties on our part, fewer than 200 casualties, we liberated Afghanistan, and we liberated the people of Iraq and the people of Iraq and Afghanistan was, of course, thousands of warriors against us and a terrorist army of thousands. Then in Iraq, we had one of the 10 biggest armies in the world, one of the biggest armies in that region who were certainly a major force; yet we took them on in just a matter of weeks. That is because we did what was necessary to reform our system back in the 1980s and to equip our people with the technology they needed.

The CIA, the FBI, the NSA are now going through that same kind of reform and soul-searching that took place in the 80s after Grenada. Already there have been some major successes. Many of them have not been announced to the public, but our CIA, for example, I know thwarted an assassination attempt on King Zahir Shah of Afghanistan, and there were no praises sung for this; but yet people in the know realized that since 9/11 and over these last few months and last years we have seen a new attitude emerge.

Perhaps it is due to the leadership our President, President Bush, is giving; and I would certainly say that our President has risen to the occasion and since 9/11 has shown himself to be a world-class leader and historic leader of our country.

This President has learned we should, when possible, have our local allies do the fighting for us. Let them fight for their freedom, and let us be there to help them. This is what President Bush, the strategy he laid forward in Afghanistan; and it is very similar to

the strategy that Ronald Reagan laid down and was called the Reagan doctrine and how he ended the Cold War. Reagan's doctrine was let us not just do it just with the American military might, but let us depend on helping local people win their own freedom; and that is what we did in Afghanistan, and President Bush also made sure that the people of Iraq knew that our purpose was there to help them liberate themselves, not to occupy their country.

Of course, we learned, and it was confirmed, that America's investment in weapons technology was well worth it, and we did go through a time in the 1990s in our predecessor's administration when there were dramatic decreases in the defense budget; and yes, certain decreases in the defense budget were warranted after the Cold War, but we managed to keep those technology weapons alive; and those developments of the laser systems that are offshoots of missile defense and other types of programs, we managed to keep them in the budget and not just is the defense budget being used as a social welfare distributing system for different systems for different groups that were preferred that our people wanted to make political fronts with. Instead, we kept it a fighting unit; and that was one of the accomplishments of this Congress, as well as working with the Clinton administration.

What did that lead us to? It led us to fewer than 200 American deaths in liberating Afghanistan and Iraq. What an enormous achievement that was.

Let us now make sure that we pay attention to what was learned; also what have we learned from what we have gone through, what we should have learned that we should not pay attention to the liberal whiners who always have seemed to be around.

There is a myth that during the Reagan years the Cold War was ended because of some kind of bipartisan cooperation. I will tell my colleagues from the inside of the White House, we did not see much bipartisan cooperation. Yes, there were about one-fourth of the Democrats who were willing to stand by the administration when the fighting was hardest with the Communists; but by and large, every time Ronald Reagan tried to make a stand against the Communists during his 8 years as President, there was an active group of people on the other side of the aisle who were doing their best to fight those who were fighting Communism. They were anti-, anti-Communists; and it is a miracle that the President was able to succeed in the way he did with the type of people who were undermining his efforts.

The Communists invested in a whole bunch of intermediate range missiles they put into Europe and immediately said let us have a freeze and left them in a position of superiority, and then we have the nuclear freeze movement which was supported by, unfortunately, many people on the other side of the

aisle; and Ronald Reagan stepped forward and said, no way, we are not going to freeze them into a superior position, and then offered, as Ronald Reagan always does and always did, a positive alternative, let us bring the number of missiles down to zero, let us agree to eliminate the class of intermediate range of missiles in Europe which, by the way, he was called names. He was made fun of. They called him an amiable dunce. They were suggesting he does not know what he is talking about, the Russians will never agree to that; and of course, within 5 years there was an agreement signed with the Russians to do precisely that.

These whiners have been with us every time America takes a stand, and it is not just against Communism. We are talking about, these are people predicting doom whenever we try to act. It seems there are people that are part of our political system, part of our political spectrum here that have a compulsive lack of faith in America itself, and they were suggesting all kinds of horrible scenarios of what was going to happen if we took a stand and acted against Saddam Hussein; and they were the ones claiming within a very short period of time after Afghanistan started, oh, are we bogging down in Afghanistan.

After 1 week of fighting, well, remember, let us not forget these predictions and let us learn from them. It was predicted that there would be a major tank battle, Saddam's Republican Guard was going to engage us in a major tank battle outside of Baghdad. Whatever happened to that? I will tell my colleagues what happened to it. We had the technology to destroy most of those tanks before they started moving up to any position where they could threaten our troops. What tank battles there were were limited. Our people were very brave; but by and large, that major tank battle, historic tank battle that would be on the scale of El Alamein and all the rest never happened.

□ 2200

What about the gas attacks and the nuclear attacks that were going to vaporize our soldiers, this fear which immobilized so many people. We have to stop our President from putting our troops in or they were going to be gassed and vaporized by nuclear weapons. That, of course, never happened.

Some ask what happened to the weapons of mass destruction the President was talking about? Let me just note I have been a strong supporter of the President from the very beginning. I have called for eliminating Saddam Hussein for many years. When I was first elected is when we went to the war in the Gulf and I told DICK CHENEY and Colin Powell then not to start this fight unless we are going to finish it. And yes, I have been critical of President Clinton, and now let us be critical of President Bush's father. He did not

finish the job. He left us vulnerable, and left a homicidal maniac in charge of the country of Iraq. Well, that was not the responsible course of action, just like many things that Clinton did were not responsible, but we had to make up for it.

I have never suggested that Saddam Hussein had to have weapons of mass destruction for us to justify joining with the people of Iraq or helping liberate the people of Iraq from this dictator or monster because he had a blood grudge against us. It was prudent for us to eliminate that dictator before he was able to amass these mountains of money that were predicted because of the oil revenues that Iraq could expect in the future years, these tens of billions of dollars. He would have bought himself a chemical, biological or nuclear weapon. He would not have to build it; he would have bought chemical and biological weapons. He would have overthrown the Saudis with the tens of billions of dollars of oil money that he was about to reap. No, it made no sense to leave that man there.

We can be proud our President made the stand, even while everyone was throwing up their hands and nitpicking and naysaying and predicting horrible things. How many times did we hear: Why did we rush to this? The President took month after month after month trying to work it out peacefully, and then he was castigated as if he was rushing into war.

We should remember that because those who were predicting weeks of house-to-house combat, building by building would have to be taken, and urban fighting. That never materialized. It never materialized. We kept saying the people of Iraq do not want to live in a dictatorship. And yes, President Saddam Hussein did have his gang of thugs that were somewhat of a threat, but the people of Iraq have by and large been on our side.

What about the massive demonstrations that were going to be precipitated by America's adventurism overseas? And of course as the war ran its course, opposition actually declined. The number of people going into these demonstrations and saying and having all of these very negative thoughts about our country and troop deployment, they decreased over the days of this military operation. And of course now that it has ended in a very successful way, no one is out demonstrating.

Remember if we did this, there were predictions that there would be chaos and destabilization throughout the Arab world and the region and there in the Persian Gulf. Oh, the instability this would create. There would be wars springing up everywhere and regimes falling and it would create a much less safe world. That did not happen, did it?

But we heard all of these predictions. Let us not forget them. Let us not forget who was making those predictions and the speeches we heard right here

on this floor by people making these very same predictions and doing their best to make sure that the American people had no confidence in their President's leadership during this vital moment in our history.

So what about the chaos and destabilization? It did not happen. What about the urban fighting that was supposed to go on for weeks? It did not happen. What about the vaporization of our troops with gas and nuclear weapons? That did not happen.

What about the Shiites rising up? There have been a few Shiite demonstrations, and most have been religious marches because under Saddam Hussein they were restricted from demonstrating their faith for 20 years. Finally, there are hundreds of thousands of them marching for their religious faith; but the left wing of this country, the news media, ends up characterizing that as being anti-American. No, the power play by some Shiites who are politically motivated in that direction numbered a couple thousand people, and we have made it clear to the people of Iraq that they are going to elect their own leaders and we are going to set up a system, we are going to work with them for a couple of years, and set up the institutions necessary for them to elect their own leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt some Shiites are going to be elected, but they are not going to be elected in the name of establishing a theocracy like Iran. They just got rid of their dictatorship. Clearly the people of Iraq would like to live in freedom; and yes, there are some powermongers there, but we are not going to let them get away with it, and the people of Iraq are not going to let them pressure their way into power.

Remember the predictions about the Turks. They were going to invade the Kurdish areas in the northern part of Iraq. These Turks were going to come in and grab the oil and there would be bloodshed and chaos. Funny thing, that prediction did not come true either. Just remember who made these predictions.

All I am suggesting is let us learn, America, from what we have just gone through so when people get up in the future and undercut a President who is trying to make a tough stand to secure the blessings of peace and liberty for future Americans we will be able to stick behind him and we will know that the naysayers will always be with us, and the naysayers will always try to undercut a President that is acting on the behalf of the United States of America perhaps because psychologically they just down deep have such little faith in our own system because they only see the flaws in America.

I see the flaws. There is no doubt that America has a multitude of flaws. Look, we had slavery in this country. We had slavery long after Great Britain eliminated slavery. We have had racism in this country over the years.

Let me point out that race relations to almost all of the other countries in the world in those days, they were just as bad as we were; but that does not excuse us, a country that Thomas Jefferson wrote down such wonderful founding principles as "Rights are given by God to every person." These are children of God, and we have not done right by many people here.

American Indians were not treated well, we know that. We know over the years we have had our share of corruption, but we know we, as Americans, have other things that we can be so proud of, that the average person has had so much more freedom here than in other countries. Even though there has been racial discrimination, we are going to try to work to end that. We have made a lot of progress in this.

Our Army during the Gulf War, if we look at who made up that Army, it was a little bit of America. Every American was there and represented, the leadership of the Army and the leadership of our country with Colin Powell and Don Rumsfeld standing side by side along with our President, George Bush.

We have throughout the administration and in Congress seen these great examples of progress, and throughout the countryside and cities throughout our country, there is not the racial hatred and animosity that there was. I personally sense since 9/11 a wonderful rebirth, if not a rebirth, maybe it is a birth for the first time, of a feeling of goodwill among all Americans. We have gone through these times before, but I think 9/11 has unified us as never before, and we are building upon that. This President is building upon that goodwill to try to help us improve this country.

One day in the Los Angeles Times, when we talk about what the President has put up with and the pessimism, and this is the day before yesterday, they had a front-page story talking about the quagmire that we are in in Iraq. Talk about naysayers. But what happened just today, look at the Los Angeles Times. The very next day they have a story detailing the emergence of new leadership in Iraq.

Something is wrong here. We cannot have a story one day where we are in the middle of a quagmire and the next day have a new democratic leadership emerging in a country that has been under a dictatorship for so long. The problem is we had critics and naysayers who have been speaking out in loud voices and repeatedly they have been wrong, they have been wrong, and they have been wrong.

What we need to do tonight and what we must do in the weeks and months and years ahead is not forget what they have been saying and how wrong they have been so we will not listen to them and take their advice and base it on pessimism, on just undue pessimism in the future.

America in the future, as we have had now, and thank God we have had a President that is not afraid to act, we

cannot be afraid to act if we are to be a prosperous people and if we are to live at peace and if our freedom is to be protected. We should have no apologies about acting in our own country's interest.

Let me repeat that because many of the people who are attacking our President are doing it based on some global strategy or some notion of what is going to happen in the world. We should have no compulsion about holding back when it is our country's interest, and I mean long-term interest. In the long-term interest of our country supporting the cause of freedom, supporting the cause of peace and freedom in this world, of liberty and justice for all as we say, this is in America's interest.

Ronald Reagan demonstrated that acting on the behalf of freedom, acting on behalf of liberty and justice, helping to support the various people struggling against the Soviet Union and supporting those people that believed in democracy, that helped end the Cold War; and now President Bush has clearly demonstrated that America's most powerful and successful strategy is not based on coalition building and some international acceptance or global strategy. Instead, our most powerful and successful strategy is one that is based on promoting human freedom.

Look at what happened in the last few months. Our foreign policy establishment seems obsessed with pleasing the international foreign policy establishment. Our own State Department, these are the people who are supposed to be doing our bidding, their liberal allies in the press and the leadership of the Democratic Party, had George W. Bush jumping through hoops. And as President of the United States, they had him going from here to there groveling before the United Nations and begging our NATO allies to join with us or to at least give us your approval.

Why should we need the approval of the United Nations or of our NATO allies to go forward and to do what is in our national security interest as long as that is consistent with promoting the cause of human freedom? By the way, again, if we are not furthering the cause of freedom and democracy, we probably should have second thoughts about what we are doing. But our enemies are the enemies of freedom. The Taliban in Afghanistan, al Qaeda in Afghanistan, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, these people are enemies of the United States because we represent what is best in Western civilization.

□ 2215

We do not and should not need the approval of the United Nations to defend ourselves and to support other people who are struggling for freedom and democracy in far-off lands. Unfortunately, this has almost become a cliché about the United Nations. People think of the United Nations as our best hope. The United Nations is not our

best hope. The United Nations is our worst nightmare. I hope the American people after looking at what has happened these last few months will understand that too is a lesson that we need to have learned. The United Nations is still with countries that are vicious, ugly dictatorships at the same level of Saddam Hussein. The world's worst human rights abuser, Communist China, has a veto power over anything the United Nations will do. We see the United Nations putting countries up that are dictatorships and human rights abusers. Fidel Castro ends up on the Human Rights Commission; and we end up being removed. Syria, you name it, these countries that do not have democratic governments, do not permit political opposition, end up in pivotal, decision-making positions.

Let us note that if we depend on the United Nations, we are going to pay a price anytime we have to do anything; and in this case it took so long, it almost undermined our entire effort in Iraq because it was just taking so much time, it would have put us in the middle of the summer and it would have compromised the entire military operation. But our President, trying to prove that he is going to do everything he can to bend over backwards in order to convince our allies and convince the United Nations that we respected their institutional prerogatives.

But what does it mean when you get the U.N. behind what you are doing? What it means is you have had to buy off the Communist Chinese. I do not know if we made any agreement, if our government ended up making an agreement with Communist China. I do not know. But I will tell you in the future, look very closely when people have a United Nations-based strategy. Perhaps in order for us to do something in our national security, they may demand that we never mention Tibet again. So we just write off the people of Tibet. Or how about other religious believers in China? Is that worth the price of getting their little approval in a vote in the United Nations? I say that is baloney. I say that is not worth it at all. There is no trade-off there. To get them to vote in the United Nations, that is worthy of us giving up millions of people in China who believe in God and so we will never mention it because we do not want to break our word to them that we are going to let them run their internal affairs now?

And then there are people in our State Department and throughout academe and the press who are trying to build this global strategy for America, yes, based on the United Nations which, as I say, very precarious, but then they want to, of course, set up an economic organization, the world trading organization, that will control trade and economic decisions so that we will have economic harmony, another great dream just like the United Nations. But if you look real close, it is a disaster. It is a disaster waiting to happen. We will have panels set up that

will be making decisions for what? It will be making decisions on whether or not our economic policies are consistent with the international agreements. Who will be on the policy boards and the commissions? And who will be running these structures and making these determinations? People from third-world countries, like Burma. How about Nigeria? How about Bolivia or Colombia? Do we really want countries like this to be making determinations if we are in compliance with international economic regulations and agreements? The people who will be serving on these boards from those countries will be bought off in a heartbeat by the Communist Chinese. We will not buy them off because we are moral. We want to go by the system. But they will not think twice; our enemies and the thugs of the world will not think twice about this.

You do not want to go through the U.N., and you do not want to set up a world organization run by countries that are not democratic in order to depend on a prosperity and a peace for the people of the United States of America. We also do not want to rely on NATO and our NATO allies anymore. NATO served its purpose, and its purpose was to deter the Soviets from invading western Europe and that is done. That is totally done. The Soviet Union is gone. Now we have a democratic Russia, a Russia who is struggling to be democratic. We do not need NATO to protect the peace. NATO is a bureaucracy, and now we find that our NATO allies whom we believe that we can depend upon are not dependable allies. We find out that NATO is worthless, that France, Germany and Belgium and even our neighbor Canada are fair-weather friends, fair-weather friends who we cannot depend upon to help us when our liberty is being threatened and when we feel compelled to act.

We have just spent in the last decade billions of dollars to help these NATO allies out in the Balkans, which is part of Europe, part of their responsibility. Yet we spent billions of dollars, put our military people at risk, and they in return gave us the back of their hand. By the way, we still have thousands of troops in Kosovo, thousands of troops in Kosovo. Yet our German, our French, our Belgian and other allies cannot get themselves to help us at a time like this. We did have, and I will say something inspiring, a new concept. As the President moved forward, he said we will have an alliance of the willing. That was extraordinarily inspiring. Great Britain, of course, stood with us. Yes, I think Tony Blair should be given an honorary citizenship in the United States of America. He and the rest of the British people are our great friends. But the people of Spain stood with us. Poland. We found our friends in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic and, yes, we found that our Aussie friends, the Australians, stood by us and proved themselves to be there when it counted.

Let me note, when the Australians come to us, I may be a bit suspicious about the World Trade Organization and setting up a grand alliance with everybody in the world, democratic or not, and having those rules apply and be applied by an international organization controlled by all these countries. I have no problem with the free trade agreement with Australia. They have proven themselves to be our friends and they are democratic.

What about one other country that I have not mentioned here a bit, a lesson that we may have learned in these last few months? What about Russia? They were not with us, were they? I have paid close attention to Russia; and I have separated it out from the rest in terms of an analysis of their potential and how we should relate to them. The Russians, I believe, first and foremost wanted to be on our side in the crisis from which we have just emerged. They requested, however, that if they would be on our side in any attack on Iraq, that the \$8 billion that Iraq owes to Russia should not be canceled. They have a very weak economy right now. They are struggling in Russia. It was a very reasonable request for them to make, that if they were going to stand side by side with us, that we not let their economy take the \$8 billion hit of a cancellation of the debt the Iraqis owed the Russians. They also said, let us be part of rebuilding Iraq. Those were two reasonable requests. We did not follow through.

We could have had Russia and the United States standing together. It would have been an awesome picture to the world. It would have presented a picture of strength that would have been very difficult for anyone ever to ignore. It would have shown a new alliance for democracy in the world. It was just a very sad thing; and I believe that if the administration has made mistakes, and all of us do, it was a mistake in passing up this opportunity and not following through on it and putting the energy into making it work with Russia as we could have. Just as I say, the vision of Russia and the United States standing there would have so overshadowed the French and the Germans and the other whiners in Belgium and elsewhere, that everyone would have known it is a totally new world. But with Russia, sort of playing games with them and being sort of part of their team, it did give a greater image of strength to those opposing us than need be.

Let me just note this. That does not mean we had to just go along. We could be creative. We could just go along and say, The Iraqis can't cancel their debt to Russia. I understand some of our diplomats were saying that, saying if they end up having to pay the debt to Russia, that is, if they end up paying the debt, it will be a burden around the new democratic Iraqi government's neck. We cannot burden the Iraqi people with having to pay back Russia so that is why we did not take them up on

that offer. That is what I have heard. That is just a one-dimensional look at this issue. If we honestly felt that we wanted to have a democratic Iraq that was capable of acting without having to have that type of burden around their neck, we should have then told Russia, we will support your cancellation of Soviet-era debts to the German and French banks. That has been a burden around their neck all this time. We could have fulfilled their desire in a different way using a creative approach by letting the Russians cancel the debt to the German and French banks. That would have sent a very good message and at the same time protected the new democratic government in Iraq from having too much debt and a millstone around its neck. But we did not do it. As I say, it is something that is past now; but we are going to have to work to make up for that what, I believe, is a mistake.

There are ways that we can work with Russia. We need to help the reformers in Russia. I know that just a couple of weeks ago there was a liberal reformer who was assassinated in Russia, showing us that we have got to stand by the good people in Russia who are struggling and even putting their lives at risk to try to build a more democratic and more decent place in what was the Soviet Union. So let us give the Russians a way to work in partnership with us and not to be considered an outsider. We did not do that during this Gulf War, this Gulf War II; we did not go out of our way to do that as we should have. The Columbia shuttle disaster, however, let me note, I am not only on the Committee on International Relations but I am also the chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee of Science, so I oversee NASA.

Let me say, the Columbia shuttle disaster, yes, it was a horrible thing and sometimes, as the Chinese say, opportunity and challenges are part of the same word. We have great opportunities in how we are going to deal with the shuttle disaster Columbia. It permits us a chance to work even closer with Russia in the satellite area and in the area of the international Space Station and space transportation. They have rocket engines in Russia that are superior to the rocket engines of the United States. We need not spend money to develop rocket engines in the United States when we can buy that type of capability from the Russians themselves. Let us let them get into the game of selling their services to the world; and when they do have something to sell, let us not cut them out by protecting our own industries. Our industries have to compete with them. Instead of spending money replicating what the Russians can do, let us spend our research dollars developing newer technologies and leapfrog technologies that will put us ahead of the game.

I know that there are some restrictions on Russia, especially in cooperating with Russia in this arena, in the

space arena, because Russia is building a nuclear power plant for the Iranians. I agree, they should not be doing that. The Iranians have oil and natural gas. They do not need a nuclear power plant. There is only one reason that they would want that and that would be to build a nuclear weapon and we will not permit that to happen. But we cannot just lay it on Russia. It is in our interest not to have the nuclear power plant built, and walk away, just like we were saying to them, you are going to have to join us and have the risk of losing that \$8 billion in Iraq, you are going to have to absorb the cost.

This is a country that is just struggling to have a decent economy to help their people raise their standard of living which has been going down for years. Now they have a chance to raise it. We should not be trying to undercut them, but let us use some creativity here. If they cannot build a nuclear power plant for Iran because Iran is controlled by hostile powers, let us help the Russians build a nuclear power plant for Turkey. Or how about Australia? Or how about the Philippines?

□ 2230

These are countries that need electricity. We could probably arrange and guarantee a loan from the World Bank, and it would not even cost us any money. We would just have to help guarantee it and arrange the business deal, and then the Russians could build that; and they would be building something that would not be a threat to us like it is in Iran, and then we could move forward with a number of space-related projects in which both countries would benefit. But it takes creativity and a commitment to freedom in American foreign policy. And the struggle for freedom, the direction of Russia, is one of the pivotal fights in our time. If Russia goes in the way of democracy in the West and builds up these economic relations with the people in the Western democracies, especially in the United States, our world will prosper and will live in peace. If it goes the opposite direction, if it begins to more align itself with China, which has an anti-view of Western Civilization and is a belligerent country to democracy or if it starts to align itself with the thugs of the world, then there will be a lot of trouble in the world ahead and the Russian people and the American people will suffer because of it. So let us have a freedom-based policy and work with those people in Russia and elsewhere looking to promote a freer society.

Unfortunately, that is not the basis of what our State Department uses to decide upon American foreign policy. After looking at the American State Department up close now for about 15 years, actually probably more like 20 years now because it has been 7 years in the Reagan White House, I would say that if there is one word that is the

goal of the State Department, it is not globalism, it is stability. They believe in a foreign policy which they call a pragmatic foreign policy, which is based on a formula for stability.

Ironically, and this is what is so ironic, pragmatism as a strategy does not work. It is idealism and the ideals of freedom and democracy that work, that help to build a more stable world. We receive stability when we put freedom and liberty and justice into the equation while we are trying to figure out what we should be doing in various parts of the world; and it is only when we have liberty and justice as part of that decision-making concept that we will find that peace is possible.

For example, in Kosovo here we are still. Years and years and years we have been in Kosovo. I remember when I was down on the floor predicting that it was going to be a decade before we got out of Kosovo, and we were assured by all those people who voted for this at President Clinton's request, it will be 1 year, a 1-year deployment. Sure. We should not forget that either. We should remember all the lessons we have learned over these last few years. We are still in Kosovo, and do the Members know why we are in Kosovo? We have got thousands of troops in Kosovo because our State Department has basically convinced themselves that we cannot recognize Kosovo's right to have their own country. In Kosovo 90 percent of them are Muslims; they are Albanian extraction. They want to have their own country just like the Croatians want their own country, just like the Slovenians want their own country, and they have got their own little country; and there is no reason why they cannot, except that would make the Serbs really mad. So in order for the Serbs not to get angry, to make sure that there is not a crisis, to ensure stability of the moment, we have kept our forces in Kosovo all of this time.

We should have worked a long time ago in order to build a consensus and reach compromises within the Kosovo society for there to be free elections and there to be a referendum; and the people of Kosovo should decide with a vote, with their own vote, whether or not Kosovo should be independent. I have no doubt that they would vote for their independence, and then we should support them in building their own defense forces to protect their borders and just let the Serbs know that, I am sorry, they cannot attack the Kosovars. They cannot attack the Macedonians; and whatever they declare their national sovereignty, they cannot attack the Slovenians, the Bosnians. I am sorry, but Serbia has got to be enough for them. By the way, each one of those countries has a map of a greater Serbia or a greater Albania or a greater Croatia, claiming that their borders used to be way down here and thus they should control it even though the vast majority of the people in those areas are no longer Croatian

or Serbian or whatever, no. Where the majority of people want to be part of a government, we let them vote on it; and if they want their independence, they have a right to declare their independence. God gave them the right to control their own destiny through the ballot box.

That is what the United States of America is supposed to be all about. We developed a system which works. It is practical, but the basis of the system is an understanding that people have a right to control their own destiny through the ballot box, and they have a right to live in peace and freedom and dignity.

In Afghanistan we are making the same kind of mistake as we are making in Kosovo. And our State Department has again proven itself totally incapable of appreciating America's experience and America's ideals of how we solve things. In Kosovo they will not let these people have their own country even though the vast majority of them want their own country because it might make the Serbs mad. In Afghanistan there are many, many different ethnic groups. And in Afghanistan the major ethnic groups, they call them the Northern Alliance right after we were attacked, and this Northern Alliance is an alliance of ethnic groups, which compose about 50 percent of the population; they were the ones who fought the Taliban, those people, and they have militias. And their militias and their generals, which they call them warlords, which is very pejorative, they fought the Taliban and kicked the Taliban out while a huge chunk of the population of Afghanistan did not fight the Taliban. They sort of sat it out. They are called Pashtans, and the Pashtans of course share Pakistan and Afghanistan. And guess what? Now our State Department, so we do not make the Pakistanis mad, we have to have the Pashtans in power in Afghanistan.

That is not what this is all about. We believe in democracy. We believe in people controlling their own destiny through the ballot box. Our State Department is pushing the French model in Afghanistan. The French model is when there is a strong central government and it appoints the police chiefs, the head of the local schools, the people who provide local services; and they do not have local government really. They have a strong central government. What do the Members think about these five ethnic groups that fought alongside the United States against the Taliban and we are telling them they have to disarm and basically let the strong central government, which is now dominated by another ethnic group who did not fight the Taliban, control them?

I recently went to Afghanistan and helped work out a compromise, and the compromise is very easy. The warlords supposedly, their ethnic groups or their militias, will disband their armies. They will demobilize. They will disarm. But they have to be guaranteed

the right to elect their own mayors and city councils, to elect their own provincial governors, just like here in the United States. Why is it the State Department cannot understand what made America successful? This is what made America successful. We do not centralize power in order to bring about a more peaceful society. We diffuse power and we let everybody share in it, and we have people electing the people who will most affect them.

I will tell the Members I do not understand why the State Department does not understand, but they are pushing the wrong way in Afghanistan. It will not work there, and it is going to cause more trouble and it is not working. It is keeping us tied up in Kosovo. We need to make some decisions here, and we should not be leaving it up to the professionals of the State Department. The professionals at the State Department, when they are negotiating, they are not negotiating, as I have just pointed out, from the idea of what is best for America or even what is most consistent with the American way of government. Instead, they have an ideal of their own in mind. It is a worldwide pragmatic organized world based with United Nations, with the WTO, with all of these world health organizations, world trade organizations, and this is the dream of the people who are representing us. So when we go into negotiations and we try to have our government directed one way or the other, we end up not having America's interest and America's ideals in place. They are not part of the bargaining table. The people on the other side of the bargaining table, they know that they are bargaining for what is good for their country. Our people are bargaining for what is good for the world, what is good for the global vision of the world.

A few years ago the Euro was in trouble. The Euro was in trouble. The dollar of the European Economic Alliance was in trouble. Why is it in our interest to help them build an economic coalition that is aimed at undercutting us? Why should we build our competitors up in Europe? Why should we help them build a currency that permits them to undercut the United States of America? Why did we do this? And this was about 4 years ago, the Euro was collapsing, and we took money from our own account here in the United States that should be aimed at stabilizing the American dollar, and we took it over there and we stabilized the Euro. We should not want our competitors to do well. Our job is to watch out for the people of the United States of America. Instead of these large grandiose worldwide treaties based on economics, we should be going individually to countries like Australia, for example, and having agreements, Japan and elsewhere, having bilateral agreements that we will insist on being enforced with other democratic countries rather than putting ourselves at the mercy, at the mercy, of organiza-

tions that will be controlled by people from countries that do not share our ideals. Yet our own State Department has this type of world as their goal.

Let me just note that during the time when our President was trying to do the bidding of the State Department and trying to jump through the hoops, trying to have a strategy based on what they wanted him to do, things seemed to bog down. It looked like we were weak and that our President lost his purpose and was not going to be following through. He kept saying that he was, but it became tiresome. It was frightening for a moment to think that he might back down. Instead, that all changed when the President gave a speech before the American Enterprise Institute, and that is when he outlined the moral basis, not just the pragmatic basis. They were going to have regime change. Remember? They were going to have regime change. That was their goal. When he spoke at the American Enterprise Institute, and I believe that was the end of February, he outlined for the people of the world and for the people of Iraq that our goal was freedom and justice for the people of Iraq and that we will only stay there long enough to help them build a democratic system.

After that our effort was energized. After that there was no stopping the United States of America because we were the freedom fighters, and those who opposed Saddam Hussein and wanted democracy were our allies, and the President allied himself with those people all over the world who believed in freedom and justice and democracy, and most importantly he allied himself with the people in Iraq who believed in those things.

Yes, it is when we stay true to our ideals, it is when we have a morally based, a freedom-based foreign policy that America becomes unstoppable because our goal is not to dominate the world but to create, yes, a better world that is based on freedom, not based on more bureaucratic organizations, but on freedom and on people treating each other decently, on liberty and justice for all, as we have said many times.

□ 2245

We would hope that as we face these challenges in the future, that the people of the United States remember what we just went through and learn the lessons. Our military learned the lessons of the seventies and eighties. Our CIA and our intelligence agencies have learned the lessons of 9/11. But the American people need to learn the lessons of what we have just been through.

There will always be naysayers. There will be pessimists, people who do not believe in our system. There will be people who believe in a global approach, but not believe in America as a leader. But we must lead the way.

The President of the United States is doing a terrific job for us, but we as the American people must stand behind

any President that is willing to act in the cause of freedom. We must lead the world, because, if we do not, there will be no courage on the part of the people who believe in freedom and justice anywhere in the world, unless they know that the United States is with them, and we are with everyone throughout the world who would side with liberty and justice and against tyranny.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of primary elections in the district.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 7 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of transportation delays.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

#### 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. WYNN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, May 7.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BASS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, May 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, May 8.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WICKER, for 5 minutes, May 8.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, May 7.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, May 7, 8, and 9.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 2003, 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:

2040. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 2002; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2041. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Singapore for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 03-12), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2042. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report in response to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2000, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 Public Law 106-65, section 1402; to the Committee on International Relations.

2043. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed export license with Colombia [Transmittal No. DTC 030-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2044. A letter from the Chair, Commission on International Religious Freedom, transmitting the Commission's 2003 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6412 Public Law 105-292 section 102; to the Committee on International Relations.

2045. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's inventory of commercial activities for the year 2002 as required by OMB Circular A-76 and the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2046. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Selective Service System, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2047. A letter from the Acting Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the Performance Measurement Plan for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designations or Nondesignations of Critical Habitat for 101 Plant Species From the Island of Oahu, Hawaii (RIN: 1018-AI24) received May 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2049. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded with Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Illinois Waterway System within the Ninth Coast Guard District [CGD09-03-209] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2050. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Miles 1062.6 and 1064.0 at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FL [CGD07-03-048] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 28, 2003, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2051. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Mianus River, CT [CGD01-03-031] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2052. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Escorted Vessel Transits, Portland, Maine, Captain of the Port Zone [CGD01-03-028] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2053. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded with Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Inland Rivers, Eighth Coast Guard District [CGD08-03-014] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2054. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Grounds and Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI [CGD14-03-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) [Formerly 2115-AA97] (Formerly RIN: 1625-AA01) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2055. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands [COTP San Juan-03-047] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2056. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Aircraft Engines CT7 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-48-AD; Amendment 39-13090; AD 2003-06-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2057. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 407 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-54-AD; Amendment 39-13087; AD 2003-05-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 4, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2058. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Hours of Service of Drivers; Driver Rest and Sleep for Safe Operations [Docket No. FMCSA-97-2350] (RIN: 2126-AA23) received April 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2059. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2002 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 766. A bill to provide for a National Nanotechnology Research and Development Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 219. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 766) to provide a National Nanotechnology Research and Development Program, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-90). Referred to the Whole House Calendar.

Mr. NEY: Committee on House Administration. H. Res. 148. A resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Eighth Congress, with an amendment (Rept. 108-91).

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1953. A bill to revise the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to naturalization through service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1954. A bill to revise the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to naturalization through service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow soldiers to serve their country without being disadvantaged financially by Federal student aid programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of certain self-administered intramuscular and subcutaneous drugs under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1957. A bill to provide for renewal of project-based assisted housing contracts at

reimbursement levels that are sufficient to sustain operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 1958. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the beginning of Korean immigration into the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1959. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for individuals serving as Federal jurors to continue to receive their normal average wage or salary during such service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1960. A bill to provide benefits to public safety officers who die or become disabled as a result of certain injuries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 1961. A bill to provide for the external regulation of nuclear safety and occupational safety and health at the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, 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. ENGEL:

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to confirm the Consumer Product Safety Commission's jurisdiction over child safety devices for handguns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GORDON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. POMEROY, and Mrs. CAPPES):

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the fair treatment of certain physician pathology services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself,

Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1964. A bill to establish the Highlands Stewardship Area in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1965. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to limit the application of that Act with respect to actions on military land or private land and to provide incentives for voluntary habitat maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Ms. HARRIS):

H.R. 1966. A bill to establish the Millennium Challenge Account and the Millennium Challenge Corporation in order to reduce global poverty through increased economic growth by supporting a new compact for global development; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1967. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Allyl Pentaerythritol (APE); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1968. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Butyl Ethyl Propanediol (BEPD); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1969. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on BEPD70L; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1970. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Boltorn-1 (Bolt-1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1971. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Boltorn-2 (Bolt-2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1972. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Cyclic TMP Formal (CTF); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1973. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on DiTMP; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1974. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Polyol DPP (DPP); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1975. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Hydroxypivalic Acid (HPA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1976. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on TMPDE; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1977. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on TMPME; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1978. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on TMP Oxetane (TMPO); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1979. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on TMPO Ethoxylate (TMPOE); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KILPATRICK:

H.R. 1980. A bill to require government agencies carrying out surface transportation projects to conduct a cost-benefit analysis before procuring architectural, engineering, and related services from a private contractor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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 Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FROST, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WATT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of

Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SABO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 1981. A bill to reauthorize the public and assisted housing drug elimination program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide to contracting officers of the civilian agencies the same authorities available to Department of Defense contracting officers to competitively evaluate products offered by Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to assure that such products represent the best value for the taxpayer dollars being expended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 1983. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the immigration to the United States of certain aliens born in the Philippines or Japan who were fathered by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 1984. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1985. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to increase the maximum mortgage amount limit for FHA-insured mortgages for multifamily housing located in high-cost areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1986. A bill to extend the period for temporary mortgage and rental payments under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act from 18 months to 24 months for victims of the terrorist attacks on the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1987. A bill to designate the air traffic control tower at Newark International Airport in Newark, New Jersey, as the "William J. 'Whitey' Conrad Air Traffic Control Tower"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1988. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to

defer recognition of reinvested capital gains distributions from regulated investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 1990. A bill to establish a counter-cyclical income support program for dairy producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1991. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require a State to charge in-State tuition rates to active-duty members of the Armed Forces domiciled or stationed on active duty in that State and to the dependents of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SOLIS:

H.R. 1992. A bill to amend and improve the workforce investment and adult education systems of the Nation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FORD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1993. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Correctional Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 1994. A bill to ensure that the incarceration of inmates is not provided by private contractors or vendors and that persons charged or convicted of an offense against the United States shall be housed in facilities managed and maintained by Federal, State, or local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1995. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make a technical correction in the definition of outpatient speech-language pathology services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1996. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements of that Act for certain computer professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. PITTS):

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Nations should remove the economic sanctions against Iraq completely and without condition; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. BE-REUTER, and Mr. TERRY):

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution recognizing the outstanding efforts of the individuals and communities who volunteered or donated items to the North Platte Canteen in North Platte, Nebraska, during World War II from December 25, 1941, to April 1, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TURNER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. NEY):

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution honoring the city of Dayton, Ohio, and its many partners, for hosting "Inventing Flight: The Centennial Celebration", a celebration of the centennial of Wilbur and Orville Wright's first flight; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H. Res. 218. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission should not revise its media ownership rules without more extensive review and comment by the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HALL, and Mr. GORDON):

H. Res. 220. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to the achievements of the Expedition 6 Crew aboard the International Space Station; to the Committee on Science.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. OSE.  
 H.R. 23: Mr. BLUNT.  
 H.R. 36: Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 49: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 58: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.  
 H.R. 119: Mr. RENZI.  
 H.R. 153: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
 H.R. 182: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 188: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 218: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. REGULA.  
 H.R. 220: Mr. HOFFFEL.  
 H.R. 223: Mr. BEAUPREZ.  
 H.R. 235: Mr. KELLER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 241: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 250: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. BALDWIN.  
 H.R. 303: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 333: Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 340: Mr. JANKLOW.  
 H.R. 367: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 384: Mr. OTTER.  
 H.R. 391: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 455: Ms. BALDWIN.  
 H.R. 463: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 466: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 496: Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H.R. 501: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 502: Mr. SHADEGG.  
 H.R. 527: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.R. 528: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 545: Mrs. KELLY.  
 H.R. 577: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 584: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 589: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 655: Mr. SHADEGG.  
 H.R. 660: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. TURNER of Texas.  
 H.R. 687: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SHADEGG.  
 H.R. 719: Mrs. CUBIN.  
 H.R. 737: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 765: Mr. UPTON, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 766: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 768: Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. TANNER.  
 H.R. 781: Mr. ANDREWS and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 786: Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. HUNTER.  
 H.R. 792: Mr. JENKINS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CASE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.  
 H.R. 816: Mr. SIMMONS.  
 H.R. 817: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 870: Mr. SCHROCK.  
 H.R. 872: Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 876: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. KELLER.  
 H.R. 883: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 898: Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. WU.  
 H.R. 906: Mr. TERRY and Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H.R. 919: Mr. GONZALES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 936: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 937: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 946: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 953: Mr. GONZALES.  
 H.R. 973: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. FOLEY.  
 H.R. 979: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
 H.R. 991: Mr. SAXTON.  
 H.R. 997: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 998: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA and Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1006: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1046: Mr. STARK, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 1056: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1061: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 1063: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mrs. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 1068: Mr. WAMP, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MARKEY.  
 H.R. 1070: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 1083: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 1093: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.  
 H.R. 1111: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 1117: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 1125: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 1137: Mr. BERRY and Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
 H.R. 1148: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 1157: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 1163: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 1168: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 1170: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H.R. 1193: Mr. RYAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 1196: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 1225: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JO

ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1244: Mr. CRENSHAW.  
H.R. 1250: Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 1260: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1264: Mr. HOLDEN.  
H.R. 1267: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WU, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. POMEROY.  
H.R. 1276: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 1301: Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1309: Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 1329: Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1336: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1355: Mr. SABO and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 1358: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 1374: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 1377: Mr. GOODE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1385: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CASE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1388: Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. GALLEGLY.  
H.R. 1409: Mrs. CUBIN and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1418: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1421: Mr. SIMMONS.  
H.R. 1429: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1430: Mr. LEACH, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1442: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1466: Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 1470: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1472: Mr. WELLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1478: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1510: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1523: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 1532: Mr. FARR and Mr. KOLBE.  
H.R. 1539: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 1540: Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 1580: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 1582: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1606: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1613: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1614: Mr. SIMMONS.  
H.R. 1615: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1616: Ms. MAJETTE and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1638: Mr. WICKER and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H.R. 1643: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1659: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. THOMAS.

H.R. 1662: Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1673: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1675: Mr. NUNES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 1682: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FROST, Mr. SCHROCK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1685: Mr. DREIER and Mr. PASTOR.  
H.R. 1690: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1692: Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 1700: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LEE, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1708: Mr. FROST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1710: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1711: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. KELLY.  
H.R. 1713: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 1714: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CASE, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1718: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 1721: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1754: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H.R. 1758: Mr. OWENS and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1779: Mr. GOODE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SCHROCK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1780: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1787: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. FROST, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1814: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BACA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1819: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1835: Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 1838: Mr. FILNER, Mr. REYES, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1860: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STARK, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1873: Mr. GOODE, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 1874: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1886: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.  
H.R. 1887: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1902: Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1905: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1906: Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS,

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H.R. 1935: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. EVANS.  
H.J. Res. 4: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.J. Res. 22: Ms. HARRIS.  
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OSBORNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. SHADEGG.  
H.J. Res. 52: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. PORTMAN.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. GOODE, Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. SNYDER.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
H. Con. Res. 91: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. FALCOMA VEGA.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. WELLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
H. Con. Res. 151: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 60: Mr. LEACH, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Res. 136: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Res. 141: Ms. SOLIS.  
H. Res. 167: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 180: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BALLANCE, and Mr. OXLEY.

H. Res. 193: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BASS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. COX, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 208: Mr. SHAW.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 766

OFFERED BY: MR. BELL

AMENDMENT No. 1: In section 3(b)(5), strike "environmental concerns" and insert "toxicological studies, environmental impact studies,".

H.R. 766

OFFERED BY: MR. BELL

AMENDMENT No. 2: In section 3(b)(1), insert "including research on the potential of nanotechnology to produce or facilitate the production of clean, inexpensive energy," after "nanotechnology research and development".