



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2003

No. 89

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 519. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the San Gabriel River Watershed, and for other purposes.

H.R. 788. An act to revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 733. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the McLoughlin House National Historic Site in Oregon City, Oregon, and to administer the site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 246. An act to provide that certain Bureau of Land Management land shall be held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara and the Pueblo of San Ildefonso in the State of New Mexico.

S. 500. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in the historic district of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era.

S. 520. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain facilities to the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District in the State of Idaho.

S. 625. An act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies in the Tualatin River Basin in Oregon, and for other purposes.

S. 635. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to update the feasibility and suitability studies of four national historic trails, and for other purposes.

S. 1015. An act to authorize grants through the Centers for Disease Control and Preven-

tion for mosquito control programs to prevent mosquito-borne diseases, and for other purposes.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. 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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

### ROADLESS RULE ROLLBACK

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, people who care about the environment were heartened 2 weeks ago when the administration declared that it would uphold the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. But alas, the other shoe dropped.

Last week, the administration proposed exempting Alaska's national forests from the roadless rule, reopening them to logging and roadbuilding. Even more troubling, the administration will also turn over significant authority over our Federal forests to the States, allowing governors to provide for exemptions.

Allowing States to exempt themselves from our national environmental laws is not a healthy precedent. States have a mixed record when it comes to environmental stewardship. They are too often overwhelmed by understandable local interest from snowmobiles to timber to water. We need a strong presence. These are, after all, our national forests.

Rather than the administration's vigorous enforcement of environmental

laws, this is another example of a settlement to further erode, rather than strengthen and uphold. There are about 50 pending timber sales in roadless areas in Alaska currently protected under the roadless rule that are ready to go forward when the Tongass exemption is finalized.

Despite the assurances that 95 percent of the Alaska's forests will be protected, the remaining 5 percent allows hundreds of thousands of acres which are among the most valuable for both the timber companies and the environment. This roadless conservation rule was developed during the last 3 years of the Clinton administration. It was finalized after the most extensive public outreach process in history. Six hundred public hearings and more than 1.6 million official comments overwhelming in support of this initiative.

The rule protects 58½ million acres of pristine national forests in 39 States. In my State alone, in Oregon, 2 million acres would have been protected.

The independent editorial boards around the country have zeroed in. In *The New York Times*, it pointed out that this is part of a continued assault on environmental protections. From day one, the Bush administration has sought to unravel the intricate tapestry of rules and regulations that have shielded the national forests from excessive logging and other commercial activities.

In the last 6 months alone, the administration has finalized or proposed new rules that would short-circuit environmental reviews, restrict public participation in land-use decisions, and weaken safeguards for endangered species.

The administration's latest target is the roadless rule. The *San Francisco Chronicle* pointed out the administration's pattern of disingenuousness. The Bush administration's doublespeak about the environment reached a new level of shamelessness this week when

☐ 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.

H5411

it announced it was retaining the roadless rule and then an announcement that it would prohibit logging on 95 percent of Alaska's national forest. Let none be fooled. What the Bush administration did was carve out huge exceptions and loopholes through a thoroughly vetted and well-balanced, popularly-supported plan to protect the ever shrinking swath of untrampled national forests.

In the Boston Globe last week, National forests are called that because they belong to the Nation as a whole, not the governors, and certainly not to the administration in Washington, who has put a former timber lobbyist in charge of them.

The Minneapolis Star Tribune, the administration's version of the roadless rule for the National forests to be published later this month, is portrayed by its authors as a fine tuning of what was arguably the Clinton administration's most important wilderness initiative. Right. It strains credibility for Clinton's successors having relentlessly assailed the rule, to claim that they are now prepared to accept it with minor modifications. Indeed, there is nothing minor about the modifications the Interior Department outlined. Fine tuning with such changes is akin to edging a lawn with a chain saw. Edging a lawn with a chain saw. Not fine tuning.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and their forests deserve better.

#### REAL RESULTS FOR WORKING FAMILIES

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 1 minute.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are responding to the Republican party's economic agenda and we are responding to their needs. Our majority were elected in part to get the economy moving again, and the early evidence suggests we are delivering results for working families.

On March 11, when the Committee on Ways and Means held its first hearing on the President's Job and Growth Package, the Standard and Poor's 500 Index stood at just above 800. Yesterday it closed above 1,000, a 25 percent increase in the stock market in just 3 months.

The long suffering NASDAQ Composite Index has risen almost 10 percent just since the President signed the Jobs and Growth Package a few weeks ago. All totalled, \$1.9 trillion in equity value has been created by the American people in fewer than 100 days. That is college savings, pension funds and individual retirement accounts. That kind of wealth creation leads to more investment, which leads to job creation and, ultimately, leads to economic growths. It may be too soon to call this a bull market, Mr. Speaker, but it is starting to move.

And in the face of this positive response from the American people, we are going to keep moving our agenda of job creation, growth and economic opportunity to help our citizens fulfill America's promise.

Last week we extended the life of the \$1,000 child tax credit, extending its benefits to millions of working and middle class families. We took millions off the Federal tax rolls all together, and got rid of the child tax credit's marriage penalty.

Our commitment to a family-friendly Tax Code will not stop there, because this week the House will consider legislation to make the 2001 repeal of the death tax permanent. After all, if we have the right to pass on a family business or farm to our spouse and children, why should our children and grandchildren not have that same right? Of course they have should, because economic security does not come with an expiration date.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican agenda for economic growth and opportunity will create new jobs and improve current jobs. That is what the American people expect and it is exactly what we are delivering.

#### ALASKAN EXEMPTION FROM ROADLESS AREAS CONSERVATION RULE

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Bush administration revised the Roadless Area Conservation Rule and exempted millions of acres of forests throughout our country. Included in these revisions are areas I recently had the pleasure of visiting, including the Tongass and the Chugach National Forests in Alaska, which are now set to be turned into the horror of the "10-Year Tongass Timber Project" which I believe is truly a disaster.

As a firsthand witness, I have experienced the beauty and the natural wonders of these two forests in Alaska. The Tongass and Chugach Forests boast the world's most intact rain forests with centuries-old trees providing critical habitat for wolves, grizzly bears, wild salmon, bald eagles, and other wildlife that have disappeared from many other parts of our country.

In 2001, the roadless rule was drafted and implemented to balance the interests of environmental and local labor groups so that a small number of timber projects already in progress at that time could be completed. Furthermore, at the time the maintenance and reconstruction of existing roads was strictly limited to cases of public safety and habitat improvement for wildlife, which meant common sense environmental regulations were put in place to ensure the health and safety of the residences of these areas where

they were tended to as well as the economic well-being of those individuals.

Those common sense regulations did not shut down Alaska. They protected the lands and the people from mining and timber interests that looked to pilage and use the lands for their and not America's own needs. However, until now, large scale timber projects, the cutting sale and removal of timber from the Tongass Forest has been prohibited.

This Roadless Area Conservation Rule was created with the tremendous outpouring of public support, demonstrated in over 600 public hearings that were held around the Nation and with more than 1.6 million comments on this rule alone, more than any other rule in the history of our Nation.

Today, in 2003, without public support or comment, the President has revised the roadless rule with an unbalanced approach that favors the logging and timber interests over America's interests and swings the door wide open for commercial logging, roadbuilding, and development on 58.5 million acres of unroaded national forests nationwide, one quarter of which are located in the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.

This is being done without any public comment, but, again, when has the will of the majority of the American people mattered to this administration?

By lifting the roadless rule in these areas, the Bush administration will destroy the Tongass and Chugach, the Nation's two largest National forests totalling 22 million acres and deprive generations of young Americans from their national inheritance of the world's last remaining old-growth temperate rainforest.

Essentially, these two forests are the Amazon of North America. They are the last vestiges of pristine wildness. They are treasures that require vigilant protection by all Americans. They are the best of what we have in Alaska. And yet, the Forest Service has already scheduled approximately 50 timber projects in the roadless areas of the Tongass National Forest and is set to sell Tongass timber as soon as these revisions are finalized.

To make the situation worse, according to the GAO, these timber sales have been subsidized with hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. I believe that maintaining the roadless rule will protect not only these forests in Alaska, but also Federal lands and forests in every State in our union.

As a New Yorker, I fear that the slippery slope will soon lead to logging and road construction in the forests of New York State, including the wooded areas surrounding the Finger Lakes region.

By opening the road to timber and logging, the President is sending a message that every protected wildness and forest in America is vulnerable to attack by profit-hungry interest groups. From Alaska to New York, this effort must be blocked.

Environmental policy has a lasting effect on succeeding generations. The risk of causing irreparable damage is high. These policies must be developed with the goal of balancing the interests of labor, industry, and the environment, not with the goal of increasing timber sales.

It is amazing that the greatest conservation President in the history of our country was a Republican, President Theodore Roosevelt, while we are now seeing the greatest anti-environmental President in another Republican, George Bush.

Mr. Speaker, the former poet laureate of Colorado and singer/songwriter John Denver said, "To the mountains I confess there; to the rivers I will be strong; to the forests, I find peace there; to the wild country I belong."

#### NO ACCOUNTING FOR WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN GOVERNMENT

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, as we begin our debate in our committees on reforming Medicare, one of the issues that will be highlighted is the waste, fraud and abuse that has plagued this program for decades. But this Federally-mandated managed program is not the only source of wasteful spending in waste, fraud and abuse. Frankly, the entire government endures this rampant problem also.

In March of this year, GAO submitted its report on the United States government's consolidated financial statement for fiscal year 2001 and 2002. Not surprisingly, GAO could not express its opinion on these statements due to "material weaknesses in internal control and in accounting and reporting."

It is the accounting and reporting that particularly appalls me. In the past 2 years, we have seen what happens with poor accounting and reporting in the corporate world, but it appears that the accounting irregularities continue to run rampant in the Federal Government as well. These irregularities and lack of internal controls result in "hampering the Federal Government's ability to accurately report assets, liabilities and costs."

In addition, such problems prevent accurate reporting of the cost and performance of certain Federal programs. That is, we cannot even determine what our government owns, what it accurately spends each year. GAO goes so far as to state that as a result of these material deficiencies, that the amounts reported in the consolidate financial statements "may not be reliable."

So if a person wanted to see what the consolidated financial statements of a particular agency that reported, they might as well take a scientific wild

guess, because the agency charged with examining the accounting statements of the Federal Government cannot even express an opinion because record-keeping and controls are so shoddy. Yet, we ask the private sector to keep accurate records, and if they do not, they are held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot even accurately state how much waste, fraud and abuse occurs in this Federal Government. Conservative estimates range at 20 billion plus. The government penalizes private companies for poor accounting, but when a Federal agency cannot account for billions that it has spent, what do we do? We give them an increased appropriations for the following year. We should not do this without strict accounting of these Federal agencies.

The President issued his Management Agenda designed to emphasize that clean financial records are key to a "well managed organization." I applaud the President's efforts in this area as it is a daunting task to reform such a bureaucratic beast. The government requires its citizens every year to pay an ever-increasing burden in Federal taxes and users fees for expanding Federal programs. The least we could do is to accurately report how the money is spent.

We must do this in Congress, put in place accounting procedures so we can determine what the government owns, what it spends; and then and only then can we determine where the waste, fraud and abuse is and save, ultimately, the hard-earned money of the taxpayers.

#### AMERICA IS WAITING FOR AN ANSWER

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a letter by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to Condoleezza Rice, the Security Advisor to the President, because it contains some questions I think are important.

The other night I was on Crossfire, and Robert Novak asked me whether I thought it would be a good thing or a bad thing if weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq. The show moved on before I could answer, but it was an interesting question. I think what he was getting at is whether I would feel better if I knew the President were right all along and that there were huge stockpiles of anthrax and nerve gas and missiles armed with bioweapons ready to be launched 45 minutes and a latterday Manhattan Project hidden under a stadium somewhere.

He was really asking if I would feel better knowing that I had not been misled or if I were rather nothing were

found so I could gloat over having been right when I said in September that I thought indeed the President would mislead the American people on the way to Iraq.

Of course, the answer is that I hope that no weapons are there to be found. I hope we are never in danger and that we were not in danger and that our troops were never in danger, and that Saddam Hussein, despite his aspirations, was not on his way of becoming the Saladin of the 21st century. Who would not prefer a world with fewer weapons in the hands of dictators? And if there were weapons, all Americans want them found and destroyed.

The President himself seems to have retreated from the claim that the U.S. was in imminent danger from the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. Now he is speaking of existence of a weapons program, not of armed missiles and gallons of nerve gas.

Mr. Speaker, 11 young Americans have died in Iraq in the past 15 days. Fifty have died since the President declared the war over. A total of 180 Americans and 45 coalition troops have died. What does it mean that 180 young Americans have died in Iraq? Did they die to bring democracy to someone else's country or to stop Saddam Hussein's terrible human rights abuses?

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that Hussein is gone, and I believe that nearly all Iraqis are glad that he's gone. But I do not think that the young Americans who died in Iraq signed up to fight against tyranny in general. They signed up to protect this country and our country, their own country.

In light of this where do we go? If this were still the Clinton administration, there would be a highly publicized investigation coming out of every committee in this House, including Small Business and Agriculture. There would be calls for special prosecutors, for resignation, for impeachment.

President Bush puts great store in personal responsibility, and I believe the time is long past for the President to take responsibility and level with the American people. Did the President believe that Iraq was so likely to pose a danger in the future that it was okay to play fast and loose with the Congress, the U.N. and the American people to get approval to go to war?

Was the President misled by bad intelligence? Was he misled by advisors who had prejudged the facts, or was there solid, credible intelligence that just unaccountably turned up to be accurate? We need to know.

If the President's information was bad, we need to know what steps are being taken to dismiss those who provided and vouched for it. If the President decided that future dangers were so great that misleading us about the present danger was warranted, we need him to take responsibility for that decision. We need the President to explain to us and to the world why 180 young Americans are dead and why U.S. credibility is eroding all over the

world. I am waiting to hear from the President, the Congress is waiting, and 180 American families are waiting to hear.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,  
Washington, DC, June 10, 2003.

Hon. CONDOLEEZA RICE,  
Assistant to the President for National Security  
Affairs, the White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. RICE: Since March 17, 2003, I have been trying without success to get a direct answer to one simple question: Why did President Bush cite forged evidence about Iraq's nuclear capabilities in his State of the Union address?

Although you addressed this issue on Sunday on both Meet the Press and This Week with George Stephanopoulos, your comments did nothing to clarify this issue. In fact, your responses contradicted other known facts and raised a host of new questions.

During your interviews, you said the Bush Administration, welcomes inquiries into this matter. Yesterday, the Washington Post also reported that Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet has agreed to provide "full documentation" of the intelligence information "in regards to Secretary Powell's comments, the president's comments and anybody else's comments." Consistent with these sentiments, I am writing to seek further information about this important matter.

The forged documents in question describe efforts by Iraq to obtain uranium from an African country, Niger. During your interviews over the weekend, you asserted that no doubts or suspicions about these efforts or the underlying documents were communicated to senior officials in the Bush Administration before the President's State of the Union address. For example, when you were asked about this issue on Meet the Press, you made the following statement:

"We did not know at the time—no one knew at the time, in our circles—maybe someone knew down in the bowels of the agency, but no one in our circles knew that there were doubts and suspicions that this might be a forgery. Of course, it was information that was mistaken."

Similarly, when you appeared on This Week, you repeated this statement, claiming that you made multiple inquiries of the intelligence agencies regarding the allegation that Iraq sought to obtain uranium from an African country. You stated:

"George, somebody, somebody down may have known. But I will tell you that when this issue was raised with the intelligence community . . . the intelligence community did not know at that time, or at levels that got to us, that this, that there were serious questions about this report."

Your claims, however, are directly contradicted by other evidence. Contrary to your assertion, senior Administration officials had serious doubts about the forged evidence well before the President's State of the Union address. For example, Greg Thielmann, Director of the Office of Strategic Proliferation, and Military Issues in the State Department, told Newsweek last week that the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) had concluded the documents were "garbage." As you surely know, INR is part of what you call "the intelligence community." It is headed by an Assistant Secretary of State, Carl Ford; it reports directly to the Secretary of State; and it was a full participant in the debate over Iraq's nuclear capabilities. According to Newsweek.

"What I saw that, it really blew me away," Thielmann told Newsweek. Thielmann knew about the source of the allegation. The CIA

had come up with some documents purporting to show Saddam had attempted to buy up to 500 tons of uranium oxide from the African country of Niger. INR had concluded that the purchases were implausible—and made that point clear to Powell's office. As Thielmann read that the president had relied on these documents to report to the nation, he thought, "Not that stupid piece of garbage. My thought was, how did that get into the speech?"

Moreover, New York Times columnist Nicholas D. Kristof has reported that the Vice President's office was aware of the fraudulent nature of the evidence as early as February 2002—nearly a year before the President gave his State of the Union address. In his column, Mr. Kristof reported:

"I'm told by a person involved in the Niger caper that more than a year ago the vice president's office asked for an investigation of the uranium deal, so a former U.S. ambassador to Africa was dispatched to Niger. In February 2002, according to someone present at the meetings, that envoy reported to the C.I.A. and State Department that the information was unequivocally wrong and that the documents had been forged. The envoy reported, for example, that a Niger minister whose signature was on one of the documents had in fact been out of office for more than a decade. . . . The envoy's debunking of the forgery was passed around the administration and seemed to be accepted—except that President Bush and the State Department kept citing it anyway. "It's disingenuous for the State Department people to say they were bamboozled because they knew about this for a year," one insider said."

When you were asked about Mr. Kristof's account, you did not deny his reporting. Instead, you conceded that "the Vice President's office may have asked for that report."

It is also clear that CIA officials doubted the evidence. The Washington Post reported on March 22 that CIA officials "communicated significant doubts to the administration about the evidence." The Los Angeles Times reported on March 15 that "the CIA first heard allegations that Iraq was seeking uranium from Niger in late 2001," when "the existence of the documents was reported to [the CIA] second- or third-hand." The Los Angeles Times quoted a CIA official as saying: "We included that in some of our reporting, although it was all caveated because we had concerns about the accuracy of that information."

With all respect, this is not a situation like the pre-9/11 evidence that al-Qaeda was planning to hijack planes and crash them into buildings. When you were asked about his on May 17, 2002, you said:

"As you might imagine . . . a lot of things are prepared within agencies. They're distributed internally, they're worked internally. It's unusual that anything like that would get to the president. He doesn't recall seeing anything. I don't recall seeing anything of this kind."

That answer may be given more deference when the evidence in question is known only by a field agent in an FBI bureau in Phoenix, Arizona, whose suspicions are not adequately understood by officials in Washington. But it is simply not credible here. Contrary to your public statements, senior officials in the intelligence community in Washington knew the forged evidence was unreliable before the President used the evidence in the State of the Union address.

In addition to denying that senior officials were aware that the President was citing forged evidence, you also claimed (1) "there were also other sources that said that there were, the Iraqis were seeking yellowcake—uranium oxide—from Africa" and (2) "there

were other attempts to get yellowcake from Africa."

This answer does not explain the President's statement in the State of the Union address. In his State of the Union address, the President referred specifically to the evidence from the British. He stated: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." Presumably, the President would use the best available evidence in his State of the Union address to Congress and the nation. It would make no sense for him to cite forged evidence obtained from the British if, in fact, the United States had other reliable evidence that he could have cited.

Moreover, contrary to your assertion, there does not appear to be any other specific and credible evidence that Iraq sought to obtain uranium from an African country. The Administration has not provided any such evidence to me or my staff despite our repeated requests. To the contrary, the State Department wrote me that the "other source" of this claim was another Western European ally. But as the State Department acknowledged in its letter, "the second Western European government had based its assessment on the evidence already available to the U.S. that was subsequently discredited."

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) also found no other evidence indicating that Iraq sought to obtain uranium from Niger. The evidence in U.S. possession that Iraq had sought to obtain uranium from Niger was transmitted to the IAEA. After reviewing all the evidence provided by the United States, the IAEA reported: "We have to date found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq." Ultimately, the IAEA concluded: "These specific allegations are unfounded."

As the discussion above indicates, your answers on the Sunday talk shows conflict with other reports and raise many new issues. To help address these issues, I request answers to the following questions:

1. On Meet the Press, you said that "maybe someone knew down in the bowels of the agency" that the evidence cited by the President about Iraq's attempts to obtain uranium from Africa was suspect. Please identify the individual or individuals in the Administration who, prior to the President's State of the Union address, had expressed doubts about the validity of the evidence or the credibility of the claim.

2. Please identify any individuals in the Administration who, prior to the President's State of the Union address, were briefed or otherwise made aware that an individual or individuals in the Administration had expressed doubts about the validity of the evidence or the credibility of the claim.

3. On This Week, you said there was other evidence besides the forged evidence that Iraq was trying to obtain uranium from Africa. Please provide this other evidence.

4. When you were asked about reports that Vice President Cheney sent a former ambassador to Niger to investigate the evidence, you stated "the Vice President's office may have asked for that report." In light of this comment, please address: (a) Whether Vice President Cheney or his office requested an investigation into claims that Iraq may have attempted to obtain nuclear material from Africa, and when any such request was made; (b) Whether a current or former U.S. ambassador to Africa, or any other current or former government official or agent, traveled to Niger or otherwise investigated claims that Iraq may have attempted to obtain nuclear material from Niger; and (c) What conclusions or findings, if any, were reported to the Vice President, his office, or

other U.S. officials as a result of the investigation, and when any such conclusions or findings were reported.

On Sunday, you stated that "there is now a lot of revisionism that says, there was disagreement on this data point, or disagreement on that data point." I disagree strongly with this characterization. I am not raising questions about the validity of an isolated "data point," and the issue is not whether the war in Iraq was justified or not.

What I want to know is the answer to a simple question: Why did the President use forged evidence in the State of the Union address? This is a question that bears directly on the credibility of the United States, and it should be answered in a prompt and forthright manner, with full disclosure of all the relevant facts.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,  
Ranking Minority Member.

### MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, both houses of Congress are continuing the difficult task of drafting comprehensive Medicare reform legislation this week.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep moving forward in the spirit of compromise on this extremely important issue.

Mr. Speaker, as time passes, the expectations of our constituencies continue to grow. We cannot return to our respective districts on the Fourth of July without some news of progress in the halls of Congress on a prescription drug plan for our seniors through Medicare.

Our colleagues in the other body have set the goal of reaching an agreement by the next recess, and I strongly urge my colleagues in this body to work on a bipartisan basis in order to reach a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue and we can not allow it to fail because of partisan differences.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Lincoln Echo Newspaper for 10 years of service to Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Last week, the Lincoln Echo celebrated its 10-year anniversary. It began with the mission of unifying Fort Smith's African-American community. When the paper was sold in 2001, its mission statement changed to reflect the changes in Fort Smith. Their new aim became to unify Fort Smith's diverse communities.

Their work has been noticed not only in Fort Smith but around the country, reaching over 25,000 readers in 29 different States. This paper has preached the importance of unity in our neighborhoods and continuously relays a positive message to all of its readers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Napoleon Black, Allen Black, Jr., Cecil Greene, Jr., and everyone involved in the Echo's success. I look forward to many more years of success for the Lincoln Echo.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the capital markets do not much care for indecision. When a company or industry is in regulatory flux, the industry is basically forced to be at a standstill. That is what is happening today with the telecommunications industry.

The Federal Communications Commission voted on February 20, 2003 to make changes to the way it regulates telecommunications carriers. Many of the changes were very significant, but the FCC is dragging its feet. These decisions will drive the short and long term future of the telecom industry. The industry, however, is stymied because the FCC, while having voted on the issue, has yet to issue the rules. This is quite unusual as texts of orders are issued usually within weeks or even days of the date that the item is voted on.

Here we are, almost 4 months later, and we still have no rules issued. It takes less time for a pig from time of conception to time of birth than it has taken the FCC to give birth to the written words embodying the agreements voted on in February.

The FCC needs to stop this nonsensical delay and issue its orders so the industry can get back to the business of building infrastructure and serving the telecommunications users of this Nation.

### SAVE OUR FORESTS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration is about to open up our national forests to a new phase of road building. Now, in preparation for commenting on this, I had my staff check because the last time I had checked with the Forest Service, they had an 8 billion, not million, \$8 billion backlog on maintenance on Federal forest roads. Hundreds of thousands of miles of road, crisscrossing the United States, the West, and yet they have an \$8 billion backlog.

Now, the Forest Service said yesterday said, no, no, no, the Congressman is wrong. It is not 8 billion. We just recalculated it. And I thought, well, this will be good news. It is \$10.5 billion. The Forest Service has a \$10.5 billion backlog on Forest Service roads. Of the 382,000 miles of roads, only 21 percent meet their maintenance standards; 50 percent are declared unsafe for driving; and 50,000 miles of roads are missing

from the data. They are unclassified. They might be there. They might not. They might be passable; they might not. They have not had a chance to go out and look lately. Yet they are proposing under the Bush administration to begin a new phase of road building. Well, how is that?

Well, we heard a couple of weeks ago they will uphold the Clinton Roadless Rule. And I had some folks in Oregon say to me, We cannot believe that the Bush administration will uphold the Clinton roadless rule. And I said, Well, there were an incredible number of comments on that rule, over 2.2 million, over 600 public meetings. It was hard fought, well constructed, well thought out, and it was very popular among most folks in the western United States. And yet, I said, it does seem unusual.

Well, it turns out, no, they are not really going to uphold the roadless rule. They will immediately put in place exceptions for the Chugach and the Tongass Forests in Alaska, 300,000 acres. Except 300,000 acres of timber harvest with roads in the Tongass Forest will affect well over a million acres of land with fragmentation and eroding and other problems, perhaps even more. And, of course, there is the expense that comes with that. And then in the Lower 48 they will have a national policy, sort of, except they will develop an exception process where Governors can ask for exceptions on Federal lands for the roadless rule.

What kind of national policy is this?

At the same time they are staring in the face of an over \$10 billion backlog, which they have no intention of dealing with because, of course, there is no money to deal with thinning or fire protection or even fighting forest fires, and particularly low on the totem pole is road construction. Every year the road maintenance unanimous money is stolen and used to fight fires, and they do not put the money back, and they never get around to it; and the backlog has grown by \$2 billion since this President has been in office.

The roads are unsafe. They are crumbling. They are causing all sorts of problems with erosion into pristine streams. They need culvert work. They will erode worse without the culvert work. And yet this administration wants to go on another road-building binge to fragment up the little bit of remaining roadless area in the United States. Just like Gale Norton recently said that all of the wilderness areas under study by the BLM would no longer be studied for wilderness value. The Forest Service, under the direction of this administration, wants to make certain they put in enough roads before this President leaves office, to fragment that up so those areas can never again be considered for roadless or wildness designation.

This is wrong-headed policy at the wrong time. This administration should do what it said it was going to do, uphold the roadless rule in all of

the States, and then it should begin to deal with the very real needs of the Forest Service, to deal with its maintenance backlog. Some of these roads need dramatic amounts of work in the short term. I have some in my district that have been promised for several years that roads, washed out in flood 5 years ago would be rebuilt; and yet the money, as I say, each summer has been taken away and spent on fighting forest fires because there is not enough money in the budget to fight forest fires because, of course, the administration has no money because they have given it away in tax cuts to all the rich people. So this is a pretty strange way to run a country and make a policy on Federal lands that are so precious to the heritage and to the environmental future of our Nation.

#### ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, as I fly across America, which I do every Monday and Friday from Seattle to Dulles Airport, every time I fly I realize what a beautiful country we have, truly the most beautiful one both for our democracy and in our beautiful lands. And those lands now are still at risk because the current administration, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) so well laid out, threatens to violate the roadless area rule and violate the very clear desires of Americans to protect the last remaining pristine areas in our national forests.

Now, we have an opportunity to stop this administration from gutting the roadless area rule. And I hope that my colleagues will join the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and myself in co-sponsoring the Roadless Area Conservation Act of 2003.

This bill will simply incorporate the existing rule that protects the last remaining one-third of our national forests that truly are the crown jewels of our national forest system. And it will protect by preventing future road building, road building that has already covered 360,000 miles of roads in our national forests already, most of which are built for timber harvest, much of which is no longer usable. At least 60,000 of those miles of road are no longer usable by anyone, even though they were used and built with taxpayer money. That is enough road to go around the world 16 times already in our national forests.

Now, in response to that, Americans came out in droves over the last 3 years at over 600 public meetings held by the Federal Government to ask Americans what they wanted to do with their national forests. At those over-600 meetings of 2 million Americans, both in person and by e-mail let-

ter, responded with the very clear and dramatic message, preserve these last remaining virgin pristine areas. Over 96 percent of Americans who addressed this issue had a single message for the President of the United States: keep the clear-cutting and the bulldozers out of these remaining forests. And we got some good news rhetorically from the administration because rhetorically the administration said that they are going to keep the roadless area rule. But, it is one of those big "buts" that you hear so much of in life; they were going to slash and burn by exempting Alaska. And they were going to slash and burn by exempting other States, as long as in some process, it remains uncertain, the Governor of that State wanted to exempt that particular State.

In fact, some of the biggest tracts, in fact, the biggest tracts, the most biologically intact tracts of land in the world for temperate forests are in the Tongass and Chugach National Forests which are right now protected by the roadless area rule, which if the President has his way will no longer be protected. These are the most biologically productive rain forests in the world that the administration wants to now open up to clear-cutting and road building, to strip away the protection that over 2 million Americans spoke so loudly to keep, and that is just wrong. It is wrong because Americans do not want it, and it is wrong because it violates the whole spirit of the roadless area rule.

You cannot say you are going to uphold the roadless area rule and then strip out the largest forests in the United States from its protection. It is kind of like the President saying, We will have the No Child Left Behind Act, but we will exempt the children in Alaska because they are some kind of lesser Americans, and then we will also exempt the States where Governors say we do not want to have this protection of No Child Left Behind.

We believe that all American forests, including Alaska, including all 50 States, are entitled to the roadless area rule.

Now, in my State of Washington, we are kind of proud of our forests too. We have three very beautiful roadless area rules that we want to see statutorily protected, protected by a law passed by Congress so that no President of either party in the future can cave in to special interests to allow clear-cutting in these forests. These are in the Colville National Forest, they are in the Dark Divide area in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, and my personal favorite, the Olympic National Forest close to where I live in Kitsap County, Washington.

In that forest there are two trees at the end of a trail in this roadless area, two beautiful Douglas firs. They are about maybe 8 feet in diameter. Incredible trees. We call them Theodore and Franklin after the Roosevelts who were so responsible for protecting these

areas that are now subject to the roadless area rule.

Our message from Washington State is, Theodore and Franklin deserve protection, and their cousins in Alaska deserve protection, and every tree in these protected roadless areas deserve protection. I hope my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this bill and send a message to the administration, we want the roadless area, not just pieces.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon today.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at noon.

#### PRAYER

Dr. David Halpern, Rabbi, Flatbush Park Jewish Center, Brooklyn, New York, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Sovereign of the world, we stand in the House of freely elected representatives of all the American people. These men and women, dedicated and strong, have accepted the awesome burden of promulgating the laws by which our free society lives and shall live. They wear this mantle of leadership in profoundly perilous times.

The threat to human security wears many faces: Tyranny, terror, religious oppression, racial tension, disease, hunger and despair. We seek the solution to these problems. We search diligently for the road to peace, for the path to harmonious living, for the means to achieve human dignity for us all created in Thine image.

May we always remember that to safeguard our own freedom, we must speak out against oppression, and, where warranted, even take up arms against it. To enjoy the blessings of our own wealth, we must also provide for the underprivileged and the needy. To be truly strong requires more than strength of arms, it requires strength of spirit.

Almost six decades have passed since the age of the Nazi death camps, the places where 6 million Jewish men, women and children had their lives cruelly and brutally ended, their only sin that they were born Jewish. The world has watched helplessly as in the last decade hundreds of thousands of different nationalities and ethnic groups have been slaughtered. We pray that the destruction of man by his fellow because of religious beliefs or racial origins will be known no more;

that people of different religious paths may learn to live side-by-side in peace and in harmony.

We ask Thy blessing upon these members of our Congress, the spiritual heirs of those who were so instrumental in bestowing upon the seed of Israel the restoration of their homeland. We pray that our President will succeed in his determined mission of building peace with security and of shining the bright light of freedom upon that benighted part of the world.

Grant that our President and Vice President and all our elected leaders will be blessed with clear vision to see and understand the future, and the courage and heart to make it a blessed and beautiful reality.

We pray in the words of Isaiah: May the spirit of the Lord rest upon us, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and fear of the Lord. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

---

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LANTOS 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.

---

WELCOMING DR. DAVID HALPERN, RABBI, FLATBUSH PARK JEWISH CENTER, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to welcome to the Chamber

Rabbi David Halpern, who offered our opening prayer. I thank him for his thoughtful invocation.

Madam Speaker, Rabbi Halpern's accomplishments in his community of Flatbush, Brooklyn, have touched many lives across the Nation, and his work merits national recognition.

He leads the Flatbush Park Jewish Center. He is the Principal of the religious school there, which he helped found in 1952. He sought to create a place where religiously observant and religiously curious alike can feel comfortable; to advance the goal of Jewish learning; and to support Jewish causes around our country and around the globe. He also served as a Chaplain in the 71st Infantry of the 42nd Division of the National Guard for 10 years, and he sits on the New York board of Rabbis.

Madam Speaker, the esteem in which the Flatbush Park Jewish Center is held indicates that Rabbi Halpern's efforts have been an unqualified success. In recognition of his sense of compassion and leadership, he was chosen to speak on behalf of the community of Flatbush in the wake of the 9/11 tragedy.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted that he was able to share some of his wisdom and grace with us today. We admire his commitment to his faith and to his community.

---

#### MODERNIZING MEDICARE

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the House in support of the Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act, which will be marked up in the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce this morning.

Modernizing Medicare with a prescription drug benefit puts a down payment on a healthy future for Americans. The House has an historic opportunity to bring up to date our health care system for millions of seniors.

The bill that will soon be before this House reflects the compassionate conservatism of my party. It is compassionate because it is providing much needed prescription drug coverage to Americans on a fixed income. It is conservative because prescription drugs often provide the ounce of prevention that beats the pound of cure. It is conservative because this legislation will serve the people today without breaking the bank tomorrow. It makes no financial sense to cover astronomically expensive surgery and not cover drugs that could have prevented that surgery.

We have promised a benefit to our seniors for years. This year, this year, Madam Speaker, it is time to deliver.

WELCOMING DR. DAVID HALPERN, RABBI, FLATBUSH PARK JEWISH CENTER, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

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

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, it is not usual that a relatively young man like myself can say that I have known someone well for nearly 20 years, but it is in that spirit that I welcome Rabbi David Halpern here this morning and thank him for his thoughtful words.

Brooklyn is full of distinguished spiritual leaders, and Rabbi Halpern stands out as a giant among them. Rabbi Halpern is a past President of the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush, where he served as Chairman of the Board's Membership Committee for 13 years. He is also a prominent member of other Rabbinical organizations and the Rabbinical Council of the United States.

He is widely respected and recognized for his intellect and wisdom, but, if there is one thing that distinguishes Rabbi Halpern, it is dedication not only to his faith, but in particular to his congregants and his community. More than 50 years ago, Rabbi Halpern became the first Rabbi of the Flatbush Park Jewish Center. And more than 50 years later, Rabbi Halpern is still there, and the community is stronger than ever.

Under his leadership, Flatbush Park has grown from a gathering of only 65 families in a rented store into a Modern Orthodox congregation of more than 500 family members. Today, there are thousands of people in Brooklyn and beyond whose spiritual lives were shaped by Rabbi Halpern.

As hard as I try to express what Rabbi Halpern means to this community, the ultimate testament is how many people joined him on his journey to Washington today. Dozens from his community, as well as distinguished Rabbis, are here in his honor, and it is my particular pleasure to welcome Rabbi Halpern's wife Sheila, his son Neil, his daughters Risa and Beth, his son-in-law Dennis and his granddaughter Lauren who are in Washington on this most important occasion.

In closing, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and our grateful community, I would like to thank Rabbi Halpern for his eloquent words this morning and for his service to our whole country.

---

#### HONORING JACKSON TOBISKA, 2003 PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLAR

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Jackson Tobiska, a senior at Orange County's High School of the Arts, for being selected as a 2003 Presidential Scholar.

Jackson is one of 137 winners of this very prestigious award, selected nationally by a 32 member commission. It is comprised of leaders in education, medicine, law, social services and government, and they select the scholars. The scholars are selected based on their academic skills, on their community service, and, of course on their leadership skills.

In a time when there are budget cuts that are cutting across our education system and when our schools, especially in my home State, are suffering, it is refreshing to see that both students and teachers are dedicated to academic excellence.

I am very proud of Jackson for his hard work and for being selected as a Presidential Scholar for 2003. He reminds us that with determination and with dedication, anything is possible.

#### INVESTIGATING REASONS FOR GOING TO WAR

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the Committee on International Relations is at this very moment reviewing a resolution of inquiry submitted by me and cosponsored by 36 Members of the House of Representatives asking for the administration to provide whatever evidence to this Congress that caused them to send this country on a path towards war against Iraq.

The American people have a right to know why their sons and daughters were sent to war. They have a right to know whether or not this administration provided the American public with information that was false.

We need to know on what basis did the American people learn from this administration that there was an imminent threat, and, in fact, was there an imminent threat coming from Iraq, did Iraq have weapons of mass destruction that posed an imminent threat.

It is up to the Committee on International Relations of the House to provide the American people with an opportunity to get that information from this administration. This Congress exists to provide a balance to administrative power, and it is time that this Congress stood up to its responsibility. The people have a right to know, was there an imminent threat and where are the weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1215

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). 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.

Any record vote on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DULUTH BULLDOGS FOR WINNING THE NCAA 2003 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 171) commending the University of Minnesota Duluth Bulldogs for winning the NCAA 2003 National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 171

Whereas on Sunday, March 23, 2003, the two-time defending NCAA National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey champion, the University of Minnesota Duluth Bulldogs, won the National Championship for the third straight year;

Whereas Minnesota Duluth defeated Harvard University in double overtime of the championship game by the score of 4-3, having defeated Dartmouth College 5-2 in the semifinal;

Whereas sophomore Nora Tallus scored the game-winning goal in the second overtime, assisted by Erika Holst and Joanne Eustace;

Whereas during the 2002-2003 season, the Bulldogs won an impressive 31 games, while losing only 3 and tying 2;

Whereas forwards Jenny Potter, Hanne Sikio, and Caroline Ouellette were selected to the 2003 All-Tournament team and Caroline Ouellette was named the tournament's Most Outstanding Player;

Whereas the Bulldogs are the only team in the country to earn a berth in the women's national championship tournament in each year of its existence;

Whereas junior forward Jenny Potter was one of three finalists for the Patty Kazmaier Memorial Award, given annually to the most outstanding player in women's collegiate varsity ice hockey and was named to the Jofa Women's University Division Ice Hockey All-American First Team;

Whereas senior forward Maria Rooth, for the fourth time, was one of ten finalists for the Patty Kazmaier Memorial Award, and was named to the Jofa Women's University Division Ice Hockey All-American Second Team;

Whereas Minnesota Duluth Head Coach Shannon Miller, after winning the National Championship in three consecutive years, has been named a finalist for the American Hockey Coaches Association 2002-2003 University Division Women's Ice Hockey Coach of the Year Award; and

Whereas all of the team's players showed tremendous dedication throughout the season toward the goal of winning the National Championship: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Minnesota Duluth women's hockey team for winning the NCAA 2003 National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the team's players, coaches, and support staff and invites them to the United States Capitol Building to be honored;

(3) requests that the President recognize the achievements of the University of Minnesota Duluth women's hockey team and invite them to the White House for an appropriate ceremony honoring a national championship team; and

(4) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled cop-

ies of this resolution to the University of Minnesota Duluth for appropriate display and to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to each coach and member of the NCAA 2003 National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Championship team.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 171.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 171; and I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for bringing this resolution forward.

Madam Speaker, this resolution recognizes the achievement of the University of Minnesota Duluth women's hockey team, the Bulldogs, for their NCAA National Collegiate championship. This victory marks the third consecutive national championship for the Bulldogs.

The national champion Bulldogs deserve recognition for their double overtime victory against a talented Harvard University team. In addition to the inspiring team victory, four individuals distinguished themselves from the field: three young women from the University of Minnesota of Duluth were named to the All-Tournament team, and Coach Shannon Miller was named the 2003 AHCA Women's Division Coach of the Year. The distinction earned by these individuals and the remarkable repeat victories of the team reflect the dedication of each player, the leadership of Coach Shannon Miller, and the support of family, friends, and fans.

I extend my congratulations to each of the hard-working players on the successful Bulldog team, to Coach Miller, and to the University of Minnesota Duluth. I am happy to join my colleagues in honoring the accomplishment of this team and wish them continued success. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to support House Resolution 171, commending the University of Minnesota Duluth women's hockey team for winning the NCAA 2003 National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Championship.

I also too want to congratulate Bulldog Coach Shannon Miller for being

named the 2003 American Hockey Coach's Association Women's University Division Coach of the Year. We are all proud of the extraordinary accomplishment of these women.

The March 23 triumph of the UMD Bulldogs over Harvard has been referred to as the greatest game in the history of college women's hockey, played before a record-breaking crowd of over 5,000, double overtime, 4 to 3, in order to defeat the Harvard team. This gave the Bulldogs their third consecutive national championship. In only the fourth season of their existence, the Bulldogs have brought the sport of women's hockey to a new and exciting level.

The success that this team has achieved over the past few years has helped to fuel a women's hockey explosion in Minnesota and across the country. Twenty-nine colleges now sponsor Division I teams, and the NCAA is considering expanding its field in 2005. In Minnesota, the number of high school women's hockey teams has rocketed from 24 in 1995 to 128 today. Nationwide, the number of girls and women playing ice hockey has increased more than four-fold in this last decade, with more than 39,000 registered females playing hockey today.

The success of the Bulldogs and the ever-growing opportunities for women in sports remind us of the importance of title IX, the landmark legislation that banned sex discrimination in schools. It passed over 30 years ago. Title IX has kicked open the door for women and girls in athletics and education, and since the passage of title IX, girls and women have gone from hoping for a team to hoping to make the team.

Unfortunately, there are still some who would like to turn back the clock and see this law weakened. But as women continue to make strides towards equal opportunity, title IX must remain strong. We must uphold the progress we have made and continue to expand the opportunities for our daughters, granddaughters, and nieces for the next generation and beyond. Every girl and young woman must be given a chance to one day become a national champion.

Once again, I congratulate the UMD Lady Bulldogs on their remarkable achievements.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), for yielding me this time to speak about the University of Minnesota Duluth's women's hockey team. I do not know if people realize how important hockey is to us in Minnesota. It is a great sport. The people of particularly northern Minnesota have a proud tradition of hockey from the youth on up, and this is an example of how they are continuing that tradition.

Madam Speaker, this is the third consecutive championship, as we have spoken about several times. But how often does that happen? And that speaks to the great program that they have up there. It has already been talked about, the dramatic win, defeating Harvard 4 to 3 in double overtime. Any opportunity a team from Minnesota has to beat Harvard is a great opportunity, and it shows the competitiveness there is across the country.

The three Bulldog players named to the All-Tournament team and Coach Shannon Miller being named the AHCA Coach of the Year also merits additional pride. The coach has the highest winning percentage among the NCAA women's coaches.

While the Bulldogs shine on the ice, I think it is important to point out that they also shine in the classroom. Seven of the players from the championship team were named to the WCHA All-Academic team, so we continue to value education as well in Minnesota.

Madam Speaker, this team embodies the spirit of student athletes and our great ambassadors for the importance of sports and education for the State of Minnesota. I am honored to join them today in congratulating them on continuing the proud tradition of Minnesota hockey.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, congratulations to the University of Minnesota Duluth Lady Bulldogs. I know the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), and, of course, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), who represents the University of Duluth here in Washington, D.C., could not be more proud.

I have to say this was truly exciting to get to do this, Madam Speaker, because when I was a young girl trying to learn how to ice skate, hockey was not available for us; and it certainly was not available to participate on a team and even think about winning a championship. So congratulations, Lady Bulldogs.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), in saying that the women in Minnesota have confirmed what we always knew, that Minnesota is the ice hockey headquarters of the world, and we are proud to associate ourselves with them and congratulate the team.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, the University of Minnesota—Duluth women's hockey team achieved something truly extraordinary in the history of collegiate athletics in winning the NCAA hockey championship for the third year con-

secutively. It is a great tribute to the skill and stamina and determination of the women who have devoted themselves to this team and to each other and displayed an extraordinary kind of cooperative spirit that is characteristic of college athletics. It is notable that the report in the Duluth News Tribune on the championship game was written by a female reporter, and I will include the report on the game, the championship game, for the RECORD at this time.

[From the Duluth (MN) News Tribune, Mar. 24, 2003]

#### BULLDOG WOMEN CLAIM THIRD TITLE

(By Christa Lawler)

The forgotten game puck was tucked in the back of the net while the Minnesota Duluth women's hockey team celebrated its third consecutive NCAA Frozen Four title.

While streamers and confetti dropped from the rafters of the Duluth Entertainment Convention Center, University of Minnesota Duluth goalie Shannon Kasperek crawled to the back of the goal to retrieve the pesky puck that, for one overtime and more than four minutes, refused to settle anywhere.

UMD beat Harvard 4-3 Sunday night when Bulldog sophomore forward Nora Tallus, wide open, took a few strides and sent the puck low past the Crimson's goalie Jessica Ruddock, who had skated out to meet her. The game lasted 84 minutes—the longest in the history of the women's NCAA-sanctioned event.

There were 5,167 fans at the game, largely pro-Bulldogs. There were quite a few Harvard supporters and some who said they just wanted to see a great game.

"It couldn't have been better for women's hockey," UMD fourth-year coach Shannon Miller said. "I talked to (Harvard coach) Katey Stone before the game. I gave her a little hug and said 'Let's put on a show. Raise the bar for women's hockey.'"

The Bulldogs won the tournament in Durham, N.H., last year with a 3-2 win over Brown. The previous year, they beat St. Lawrence 4-2 in Minneapolis. No other team in the country has ever owned the NCAA women's Frozen Four title.

Tallus, a slight, Finnish player, was mobbed by her teammates, who created a mound of maroon on the ice on top of her. It was Tallus' eight goal of the season, and followed her game-high four penalties earlier in the game.

[From the Duluth News Tribune, Mar. 24, 2003]

#### BULLDOGS PREVAIL IN DOUBLE-OVERTIME OVER HARVARD, WIN THIRD STRAIGHT NCAA TITLE

(By Christa Lawler)

Nora Tallus repayed her debt to her teammates in full.

The Minnesota Duluth sophomore forward had all the time in the world when she skated off the boards in the second overtime of Sunday's national championship game. She took a few strides and sent the puck low, past Harvard goalie Jessica Ruddock and off the inside of the pipe, giving the Bulldogs their third consecutive NCAA Frozen Four title with a 4-3 victory.

Perhaps the greatest game in the history of women's college hockey came on the Bulldogs' home ice at the DECC in front of 5,167 fans—the largest attendance in three years of the NCAA-sanctioned event.

The game hung tied at 3-3 through one 20-minute overtime period. The ice was resurfaced and Tallus fired the game-winner at 4:19 of the second overtime to bring an end to

the longest game in the history of the women's Frozen Four.

Tallus, a small and seemingly shy player, earned four penalties—including two roughing calls—before she became the hero of the game. While Harvard did not capitalize on any of her two-minute hiatuses to the box, playing shorthanded was a dangerous proposition against the Crimson's 32.2 power-play percentage, the best in the nation.

Still, Tallus was not on her coach's bad side.

"She is a . . . angel," UMD fourth-year coach Shannon Miller said. "You could never get mad at her. After she took three penalties, I leaned down, gave her a hug and I said, 'You now owe us a goal, you understand that?'"

Tallus must have understood. The goal was just her eighth of the season.

"Yeah, I owed that for the team," Tallus said "Big Time."

Even Harvard coach Katey Stone had kudos for the goal that closed the game.

"It was an absolutely perfect shot," she said.

Hanne Sikio scored two goals for the Bulldogs and Caroline Ouellette also scored. Senior goalie Patricia Sautter had 41 saves. Harvard's Jennifer Botterill, Lauren McCauliffe and Nicole Corriero scored consecutive second-period goals, and goalie Jessica Ruddock had 37 saves.

Ouellette, a sophomore forward, opened the game with a goal at 5:17 of the first period. Jenny Potter tipped the puck to the Canadian National Team player, who was coming in quickly on the other side of the ice. Ouellette nicked a piece of the puck, redirecting to score just seconds after Harvard had returned to equal strength.

Sikio gave the Bulldogs a 2-0 advantage at 12:30 when she broke away, wound up slowly and laid the puck in the back of the net.

Harvard responded with two goals in 23 seconds in the first minute of the second period.

Botterill skated in on Sautter's right side and scored at 21 seconds. McCauliffe backhanded the puck at 44 seconds to tie the game 2-2.

Corriero gave the Crimson a brief lead when she kicked the puck off her skates and to her stick, scoring at 14:46 of the second period.

Sikio tied the game from her knees, sliding the puck between Ruddock's leg and the right post at 17:84.

Harvard star defense man, junior Angela Ruggiero, received an interference penalty at 15:05 of the third period. She vocally contested the call, and a 10-minute misconduct was added. The USA National Team player spent the rest of the period, and much of the first overtime, in the penalty box.

She darted out of the box and onto the ice quickly when her sentence was filled and gestured to the crowd that she was fired up.

Neither team scored in the third period. Just 30 seconds into the second overtime, Botterill and freshman forward Julie Chu closed in on Sautter. The UMD goalie grabbed the puck and Chu tried to shake it from her grasp. It broke free and slid to the back of the net, but after the whistle. Referees reviewed the play and did not allow the goal.

Tallus closed the game minutes later, after hearing a prediction from UMD junior forward Tricia Guest.

"Before the overtime, I said, 'My money is on you.'" Guest said she told Tallus. Guest might be clairvoyant, based on her own success. She scored the game-winner last year, when the Bulldogs beat Brown 3-2 in the championship game. "I just had a feeling. It's never been like the superstar person" who scores winning goals in title games for UMD.

After the game, Guest went up to Tallus, one of her closest friends on the team, and said, "It's an amazing feeling, isn't it?"

[From the Duluth News Tribune, Mar. 24, 2003]

#### AN AMAZING JOURNEY ENDS WITH AN AMAZING GAME

(By Mark Emmert)

Four years ago, Erika Holst, Maria Rooth and Hanne Sikio were just looking for somewhere to play hockey.

Each received a phone call from Shannon Miller, wondering if they'd be interested in attending the University of Minnesota Duluth, which was beginning a varsity program.

The trio of Scandinavians knew nothing about Duluth or U.S. college hockey, but they knew enough about Miller, the former coach of the Canadian Olympic team, to take a gamble.

On Sunday night at the DECC, their glorious careers culminated with a victory in the greatest college women's hockey game ever played. The double-overtime 4-3 defeat of Harvard, played before a raucous and appreciative NCAA Women's Frozen Four-record crowd of 5,167, gave UMD its third consecutive national championship.

Holst and Rooth, from Sweden, and Sikio, from Finland, have been the backbone of the dynasty. After the most grueling game of their career, each said their four years in Duluth have been magical, but none were quite ready to accept that they're over.

"It really hit me when we played Bemidji and we had senior night," Holst said of her final regular-season game at the DECC on Feb. 23. "Then I tried to park it. When I do decide to think about it, it's going to be a toughy."

Miller had instructed her initial senior class—which also includes Jenny Hempel, Joanne Eustace, Nevada Russell and Michelle McAteer—not to think about the impending end of their careers. The subject was too emotional, she said, and would only distract from the team's preparations to defend its title.

On Sunday, Miller said, "They're an incredible group, as people and as talented players. You can't replace these people."

The Scandinavian players each said they felt an immediate bond to Duluth and its people, easing their worries about missing their families back home.

"I fit in right away," said Rooth, UMD's career scoring leader with 231 points. "Everyone here seems to care for us."

"I really liked the lake," Sikio said of her first glimpse of her new hometown. "Minnesota is a lot like Finland. But the language was hard to understand. People here, they speak pretty fast and we were like, 'Slow down.'"

Sikio had two goals Sunday in perhaps her finest game as a Bulldog. Like her classmates, she hopes to continue playing hockey somewhere, perhaps in Canada, but she does intend to come back to UMD in the fall to finish earning her international studies degree.

"I was really surprised by how many Scandinavians are here, and the people are so nice," said Holst, whose only frustration in Duluth was not being able to find Swedish meatballs as good as the ones she was used to. "They just don't taste the same over here," she lamented.

Rooth's parents were at the DECC on Sunday to witness their daughter's final game. So was Holst's father.

"He was really happy and proud," Holst said of her postgame embrace with her father. "He doesn't usually show his emotions too much."

"They were more nervous than anyone else," Rooth said of her parents, who were wearing Swedish national jerseys with her name and number on them.

Holst, Rooth and Sikio's final collegiate game may become the one that people point to years from now as the impetus for a burst in popularity for women's hockey, much as the 1958 NFL title game, in which the Baltimore Colts registered a dramatic overtime victory over the New York Giants, put pro football on a new plane in this country.

Harvard coach Katey Stone, gracious in defeat, hinted as much, calling Sunday's game, broadcast nationally on cable TV, "one of the greatest sporting events I've been a part of."

"It was a tremendous tribute to how hard these student-athletes work and what a great product they can provide for the fans," she said.

It certainly was.

And, even if UMD's Nordic trio aren't around to benefit from a higher profile for women's hockey in America, Sunday's game certainly validates their blind decision of four years ago, when they hopped on a plane and helped make sports history at a small university in a small city they'd never heard of but were bound to become embraced by.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to point out, while we are discussing these great achievements on the ice, that the University of Minnesota, Duluth women's and men's theater troupe has five times in the last 17 years won national honors at the Kennedy Center American College Theatre Festival for performances at the collegiate level. Under the masterful leadership of Chancellor Kathryn Martin, we have a very well-rounded academic program at the University of Minnesota Duluth which includes academics, the arts, as well as athletics.

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate that we take this time here today to salute the women of the University of Minnesota, Duluth NCAA championship hockey team and all of those who participate in collegiate athletics.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Minnesota Duluth Bulldogs, the NCAA 2003 National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Champions. I thank the Gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, for allowing the House this opportunity to congratulate and recognize the Bulldogs on winning their third straight championship. During the championship game against Harvard University, the Bulldogs showed tremendous strength and ability, going into double overtime, finally winning with a score of 4-3. This season, they won an impressive 31 games, while only losing 3 and tying 2. And as we prepare to celebrate the upcoming thirty-first anniversary of Title IX, this team serves to be a prime example that Title IX is working. And since it is working, to weaken or water down Title IX in any way would be detrimental to the future of events like these and to teams like the Bulldogs.

I happen to be one who believes that there ought to be absolute equality in all endeavors

in all walks of life. I am amazed, as a matter of fact, sometimes when I recall even the Preamble to our Constitution, when we say, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,"; and at the same time, we left out women. Some people would suggest that when they said "men" they meant women as well, but I am not always sure of that.

As a matter of fact, we can look at what the experiences have been. Even though we have Title IX, only 42 percent of college athletes are female and female athletes receive \$133 million fewer scholarship dollars per year than their male counterparts. This proves that, if anything, Title IX needs to be strengthened as we still face inequities in athletics today.

We have to keep Title IX alive; we have to make sure that it is strong; and we have to keep working so that there is in fact equality across the board without regard to race, gender, ethnicity, or any other form of origin.

America is a great Nation. We have made lots of progress and we have come a long way, but we still have much further to go. I do not believe we will ever get where we need to be unless we reinforce all of those processes that we have used to get us where we are. Keeping Title IX will continue the successes that we have seen with teams like the Bulldogs and with other athletic teams in the future.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Res. 171, commending the University of Minnesota Duluth women's hockey team for winning the NCAA 2003 National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Championship. I also want to congratulate Bulldogs Coach Shannon Miller on being named the 2003 American Hockey Coaches Association Women's University Division Coach of the Year. We are all proud of the extraordinary accomplishments of these women.

The March 23 triumph of the UMD Bulldogs over Harvard has been referred to as the greatest game in the history of college women's hockey. Played before a record-breaking crowd of over 5,000, the double-overtime 4 to 3 defeat of Harvard gave the Bulldogs their third consecutive national championship. In only the fourth season of their existence, the Bulldogs have brought the sport of women's hockey to a new and exciting level.

The success that this team has achieved over the past few years has helped to fuel a women's hockey explosion in Minnesota and across the country. Twenty-nine colleges now sponsor Division I teams, and the NCAA is considering expanding its field in 2005. In Minnesota, the number of high school women's hockey teams has rocketed from 24 in 1995 to 128 today. Nationwide, the number of girls and women playing ice hockey has increased more than four-fold in the last decade, with more than 39,000 registered females playing today.

The success of the Bulldogs and the ever-growing opportunities for women in sports remind us of the importance of Title IX—the landmark legislation that banned sex discrimination in schools. Over the past 30 years, Title IX has kicked open the door for women and girls in athletics and education. Since the passage of Title IX, girls have gone from hoping for a team to hoping to make the team.

Unfortunately, there are some who would like to turn back the clock and see this law weakened. But as women continue to make

strides toward equal opportunity, Title IX must remain strong. We must uphold the progress that we have made and continue to expand opportunities for our daughters, granddaughters and generations beyond. Every girl must be given the chance to one day become a national champion.

Once again, I congratulate the UMB Bulldogs on their achievements.

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

Mr. KLINE. 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 Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 171.

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. KLINE. 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.

#### ACCOUNTANT, COMPLIANCE, AND ENFORCEMENT STAFFING ACT OF 2003

Mr. BAKER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 658) to provide for the protection of investors, increase confidence in the capital markets system, and fully implement the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2003 by streamlining the hiring process for certain employment positions in the Securities and Exchange Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 658

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Accountant, Compliance, and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003".

#### SEC. 2. APPOINTMENT OF ACCOUNTANTS, ECONOMISTS, AND EXAMINERS BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3114. Appointment of accountants, economists, and examiners by the Securities and Exchange Commission

"(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies with respect to any position of accountant, economist, and securities compliance examiner at the Commission that is in the competitive service.

"(b) APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may appoint candidates to any position described in subsection (a)—

"(A) in accordance with the statutes, rules, and regulations governing appointments in the excepted service; and

"(B) notwithstanding any statutes, rules, and regulations governing appointments in the competitive service.

"(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The appointment of a candidate to a position under authority of this subsection shall not be considered to cause such position to be converted from the competitive service to the excepted service.

"(c) REPORTS.—No later than 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2003 (for fiscal year 2003) and 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2005 (for fiscal years 2004 and 2005), the Commission shall submit a report with respect to its exercise of the authority granted by subsection (b) during such fiscal years to the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate. Such reports shall describe the changes in the hiring process authorized by such subsection, including relevant information related to—

"(1) the quality of candidates;

"(2) the procedures used by the Commission to select candidates through the streamlined hiring process;

"(3) the numbers, types, and grades of employees hired under the authority;

"(4) any benefits or shortcomings associated with the use of the authority;

"(5) the effect of the exercise of the authority on the hiring of veterans and other demographic groups; and

"(6) the way in which managers were trained in the administration of the streamlined hiring system.

"(d) COMMISSION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Commission' means the Securities and Exchange Commission."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3113 the following:

"3114. Appointment of accountants, economists, and examiners by the Securities and Exchange Commission."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAKER. 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 this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

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

It is not long ago that the revolutions of corporate misgovernance became apparent to not only those within the corporate world, but to investors around the country. The resulting consequences led many hard-working families who had planned on retirements to reconsider those plans, as the value of the 401(k)s and pensions and savings plans eroded, literally overnight.

In addition to those concerns, it was revealed to the American people that there were corporate executives who

had abused their privileges as the leader of an important national corporation and taken resources inappropriately, illegally, and used them for their own personal gain.

In light of these revelations, the SEC came to this Congress and first asked for additional funding to enhance their regulatory and enforcement capabilities, and this Congress responded. Unfortunately, because of the rules in which the Securities and Exchange Commission is constrained, the ability to utilize that \$300 million was greatly inhibited.

□ 1230

In fact, there is a provision within the securities and exchange civil service law which provides for expedited hiring of legal counsel. This particular provision is very narrow in scope but has been utilized successfully over the years to enable the SEC to acquire those legal services as it deems necessary. This provision is known as the excepted service. It is the purpose of this resolution to expand the scope of the excepted service to enable the SEC to further respond to identified problems in the area of accountancy, examination and economics.

If passed, this resolution would enable the Commission to move in an expedited manner to hire the needed accountants, examiners and economists in order to fulfill the mission described for them by this Congress. It solves these problems in a proficient and expedited manner and is important that the SEC have these authorities as stipulated to restore confidence to the investing public.

This is achieved without, I am aware, any opposition to the manner in which the bill is currently constructed. In fact, the union that represents the affected class of employees has now endorsed the legislation in its current form. I am not aware of any pending objection. I am aware of broad-based support, bipartisan support, and the legislation was reported out of committee without objection.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad to join in urging support for this bill. I want to recognize the good work done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) who is the ranking Democrat on this subcommittee, who could not be here with us today, but he spent a lot of time on it, and we have a very useful compromise.

Essentially, we had this situation where we all agreed there was a need to expand the Securities and Exchange Commission. We responded more slowly than it would have liked, but we responded by increasing the budget to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Essentially, what happened is the legislation passed last year to improve

the regulation of the corporate sector authorized increased spending for the SEC. The Congress was slow in living up to that promise, but finally, by early this year, we did it, but then the question was having voted on the additional money, in their case overwhelmingly for staff, how quickly could we hire people because under the normal rules the Federal Government is not expeditious in hiring people, and that is reasonable. There is often not an emergency, and we want to make sure we do it right.

In this case, we wanted to see that hiring was done more quickly. There was an original proposal that came that would have allowed people to be hired very quickly and, once hired, to remain in a somewhat separate status from other employees.

I want to acknowledge the very responsive attitude of the union that represents employees at the SEC, the National Treasury Employees Union. I met and talked with them, as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania whom I have mentioned, and we found them to be, not surprisingly, as they usually are, in a very cooperative mood, and they understood that there were two important issues. One was to enhance the ability of the SEC to hire people quickly so we could put the regulatory structure in place, but also to make sure that employees hired had the protections that any employee is entitled to have against political abuse, against arbitrary mistreatment, et cetera.

So what this legislation embodies is a very sensible compromise. The SEC will be given under this bill the ability to hire quickly. It will be able to hire without some of the normal rules that would slow them down, but once the people are hired, they will then have all the rights and all of the protections that any other employee would have had. It meets the need and sometimes what we do in government is kind of overdo or underdo.

The need here was to hire quickly. There was not the need, we felt, to totally revamp the employee procedures of the SEC. This bill is carefully tailored to do exactly what was needed and no more. It allows the SEC to hire quickly, to take full advantage of the additional funds. My understanding is that over 500 people will be hired under this, accountants and economists and others, but once they are hired, they will not be different than the other employees. We will not have this problem of two classes of employees, some with this set of rights, some with that set of rights. They will be fully integrated into the SEC's workforce.

It is a workforce which does very good work, which has been overstressed because we gave them a lot more to do and did not immediately give them the resources. This is a case where taking the appropriation bill, together with this bill, we will have given the SEC, whose new chairman, I must say Mr. Donaldson seems to be performing admirably, and I think we are all encour-

aged that he has done so well, and I think that contributes to the enthusiasm with which we support this legislation. There is a great deal of confidence that he will use this authority in a very appropriate way.

What we have done now is to structure things so the SEC will be able to take full advantage of the appropriation. They will be able to hire the people and the investing public and the American economy will get the protection they deserve.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, for the purpose of just complimenting the gentleman on his statement and expressing my appreciation to him for the courtesies extended during the formulation of this legislation.

At the outset, there were modest differences. I think we were able to reach compromise, and I think not only for the SEC function but for taxpayers, shareholders as well, and I appreciate the courtesies extended.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 658, the Accountant, Compliance and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003. This legislation will help streamline the hiring process at the SEC, and it will allow the Commission to employ additional, much-needed securities industry accountants, compliance examiners and economists in an expedited manner. Believe me, they need it.

As we work to improve investor confidence, I think it is very important that we work to strengthen the SEC and send a clear message to the American people that we are not going to tolerate corporate misconduct.

Last year, Congress increased the funding for the SEC by more than \$270 million. It was a 62 percent increase. We did that because we want to help America understand that we are not going to tolerate corporate misconduct. This monumental increase will help the SEC to enhance their overall operations which are crucial to implementing and enforcing new corporate governance requirements under the Sarbanes-Oxley bill, but the Commission is still severely hamstrung by current hiring practices. Now the need for this legislation is more urgent than ever.

With the hiring of accountant positions lagging far behind other professionals in the SEC, it is imperative that Congress give the Commission direct hiring authority for these critical positions. What we must do is enable the agency to fill them in a timely manner, the quicker the better, and that is what this legislation does.

I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) for introducing this important legislation and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for moving it through the committee and

working with the House leadership to get it on the floor. They have continued to work tirelessly on these issue and they are to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and help the SEC protect America's investors and restore integrity in the market.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 658, the Accountant, Compliance and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003. This very critical legislation will allow the Securities and Exchange Commission to hire much-needed accountants, compliance examiners and economists outside of the bureaucratic and burdensome civil service hiring guidelines.

In fiscal year 2003, we increased the Securities and Exchange Commission's budget by 63 percent, largely to allow for an additional 800 professional staff members. On top of that, last year's supplemental appropriation bill provided \$25 million to the SEC for the purpose of hiring 125 new accountants, examiners and economists. This increased funding was provided because the SEC desperately needs these professionals to enforce the Sarbanes-Oxley corporate accountability reforms, corporate accountability standards that were established by this body and standards that are very vital importance for investor protection. Yet, because of the bureaucratic civil service hiring guidelines, these positions have not yet been filled.

H.R. 658 does not set new precedent. Indeed, all FBI employees, as well as health care professionals at the Department of Defense, are exempt from civil service hiring standards. This is good, common sense legislation that will significantly help the Securities and Exchange Commission protect investors.

I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) for crafting this important and very timely bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to control the remainder of the time for consideration of H.R. 658.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, this no-cost, commonsense legislation will help the Securities and Exchange Commission carry out its critical mission of protecting investors and promoting capital formation and economic growth.

With the passage of last year's corporate accountability legislation and a substantial budgetary increase, this year the understaffed SEC must hire over 800 new professionals—accountants, securities compliance examiners,

and economists—in order to fulfill its regulatory obligations.

In a troubling development, the Commission has had an extraordinarily difficult time hiring these accountants and other professionals responsible for monitoring compliance with the securities laws. Under current bureaucratic rules, it takes the Commission up to 6 months to hire a single accountant, examiner, or economist. Attorneys are classified as "excepted service" employees and thus fall outside these burdensome hiring requirements.

Quite simply, this legislation will make it easier for the SEC to hire these professionals in an expeditious manner. That is good news for investors, and will help restore public confidence in the markets. It is strongly supported by both the union and management at the Commission.

I want to commend Chairman BAKER for crafting an excellent bipartisan bill and urge all my colleagues to join me in support. I yield back.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for his cooperation and assistance in moving this important measure forward. I am placing in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence regarding our committees' jurisdiction on this matter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,  
Washington, DC, June 16, 2003.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. OXLEY: Thank you for working with me in developing H.R. 658, "Accountant, Compliance, and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003." As you know, the Committee on Government Reform reported the bill, H.R. 1836, the Civil Service and National Security Personnel Improvement Act. Included in that Act was Title III, Subtitle A, Securities and Exchange Commission. It is my understanding that you intend to move H.R. 658 to the floor through the suspension process with an amendment that will be substantially the same as Title III, Subtitle A of H.R. 1836, as reported.

In the interests of moving this important legislation forward, I am supporting your request to move H.R. 658 through the suspension process with an amendment in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform. The Committee does hold an interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the amendment, and its jurisdictional prerogatives should the provisions of this bill or any Senate amendments thereto be considered in a conference with the Senate. Therefore, I respectfully request your support for the appointment of an appropriate number of Members from our respective Committees should such a conference arise.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, June 16, 2003.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you for your recent letter regarding your Committee's ju-

isdictional interest in H.R. 658, the Accountant, Compliance, and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003. I appreciate all of your efforts to ensure that the Securities and Exchange Commission has the resources it needs to effectively carry out its responsibilities under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

Your understanding regarding the amendment to H.R. 658 to be considered under suspension of the rules is correct, and the text of the amendment will be substantially similar to title III, subtitle A of H.R. 1836, as reported.

I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in this legislation and appreciate your cooperation in allowing speedy consideration of the bill and amendment. I agree that your decision to forego further action on the bill will not prejudice the Committee on the Government Reform with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I will support your request for an appropriate number of conferees should there be a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record when the legislation is considered by the House.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,  
MICHAEL G. OXLEY,  
Chairman.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 658, the Accountant, Compliance and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003. Investor protection is one of my top priorities for my work on the House Financial Services Committee, and H.R. 658 will improve investor protection by allowing the Securities and Exchange Commission to accelerate the hiring process for hundreds of accountants, economists, and compliance examiners. As a result, I support this bill.

During the last year, Democrats led the efforts in Congress to significantly augment the resources available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, including increasing its annual budget by more than \$270 million. We increased this funding to help the Commission to effectively implement the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, which we enacted in 2002 in response to a series of large-scale corporate scandals at companies like Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, Global Crossing, Adelphia, and Rite Aid.

The increased appropriations provided to the Commission have permitted the hiring of hundreds of new professionals to police the securities industry. The SEC estimates that the additional resources provided by the fiscal 2003 budget will result in the hiring of 200 lawyers, 250 accountants, 300 examiners, 10 economists, and some other specialists. This increase in the Commission's labor force comes on top of the additional 125 professionals that we allowed the agency to hire as a result of the fiscal 2002 supplemental appropriation law.

Unfortunately, as it has worked in implement the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and restore investor confidence in our capital markets, the Commission has encountered some difficulties in identifying and expeditiously hiring the best workers for many of these new positions. H.R. 658 seeks to address this problem by streamlining the hiring process at the Commission for a number of specialized professions. The Commission, like all other government agencies, already has similar authority for recruiting and hiring attorneys.

The legislative language contained in this bill resulted from negotiations between the

Commission's management and the National Treasury Employees Union's leaders. As a result, this legislation will accelerate the hiring of mission-critical workers at the Commission, it will protect the rights of these employees, and it will advance investor protection. I support each of these worthwhile goals, and congratulate the Commission and the National Treasury Employees Union for their good work. Their joint efforts help to demonstrate the effectiveness of labor-management cooperation in the federal workplace.

I am also pleased that the legislation we are considering today, unlike the introduced bill, will require the Commission to conduct two studies about the implementation of this special hiring authority. The inclusion of this study provision, which I requested, will provide the Congress with information on the use of the authority, including its impact on the hiring of veterans, minorities, and other demographic groups, that will be needed to evaluate the effects of this change in the law. It is my expectation that the Commission will use the expansion of its professional ranks as an opportunity to aggressively seek qualified veterans and minorities to serve at the Commission.

Although I support this bill, I differ with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on one remaining issue: the length of time that the Commission should have this special hiring power. As currently drafted, H.R. 658 would provide the SEC with the permanent authority to bypass civil service rules in order to accelerate the hiring process for accountants, economists, and compliance examiners. I believe that this special authority, requested by the Commission in a time of urgency, should sunset so that the Congress can evaluate the effectiveness of the program at an appropriate time. Because H.R. 658 will make extraordinary changes in the normal hiring process and because this power has the potential to be abused, the prudent course of action would have been for the Congress to sunset the law on a date certain and determine at that time whether to continue it. In short, the Congress should jealously guard the special powers that it grants government agencies.

Accordingly, during the consideration of H.R. 658 by the Financial Services Committee and the Government Reform Committee, I sought to make a good bill even better by offering an amendment to sunset the expedited hiring authority at the end of fiscal 2008. This amendment would have provided the Commission with sufficient time to meet its short-term staffing needs and preserved the ability of Congress to reevaluate this special power on a date certain. Although we did not include a sunset in this bill, H.R. 658 is still pragmatic and desirable legislation.

In closing, Madam Speaker, H.R. 658 will streamline the hiring process for hundreds of new professionals at the Commission, it will safeguard the civil service rights of these workers, and it will enhance investor protection. Notwithstanding my one reservation concerning a sunset, which I hope my colleagues in the Senate will fix during their consideration of this bill, I support H.R. 658 and urge its adoption by the full House.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman has no further requests for time, I congratulate the gentlewoman on being given the right to control nothing, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and we yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 658, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

—————

SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONGRESS SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) expressing the sense of Congress that Congress should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities;

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas although the United States is the first nation in the world to make owning a home a reality for a vast majority of its families, 1/3 of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of families in the United States that are not homeowners are low-income families;

Whereas 74.2 percent of Caucasian Americans own their own homes, only 47.1 percent of African Americans, 47.2 percent of Hispanic Americans, and 55.8 percent of Asian Americans and other races are homeowners;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity is organized in all 50 States with 1,655 local affiliates and its own section 501(c)(3) Federal tax-exempt status and locally elected completely voluntary board of directors;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity has built nearly 150,000 houses worldwide and endeavors to complete another 50,000 homes by the year 2005;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the month of June has been designated as "National Homeownership Month": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) everyone in the United States should have a decent home in which to live;

(2) Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism;

(3) during the years of the 108th and 109th sessions of Congress, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, Habitat for Humanity, and contributing organizations, should sponsor and construct 2 homes in the Washington, D.C., metro area each as part of the "Congress Building America" program;

(4) each Congress Building America house should be constructed primarily by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, their families and staffs, and the staffs of sponsoring organizations working with local volunteers involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each Congress Building America house should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) in the future, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, their families, and their staff should participate in similar house building activities in their own States as part of National Homeownership Month; and

(7) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing decent homes for all of the people in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. 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 this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing support for Congress Building America and for increased affordable home ownership opportunities.

This country is home to people of many different origins, but everyone seems to have the same dream, to own their own home. This dream means many things: Independence, financial security, geographic stability, the ability to accumulate personal wealth, a place to raise a family, or simply a place to go after a long day's work and find peace.

As a homebuilder for over 30 years, I enjoyed watching many people achieve this dream. One could always see the excitement and anticipation in the face of a home buyer. The Congress Building America program will offer every Member of Congress this opportunity to experience how the dream of homeownership builds hope in their communities and across the Nation.

I feel very strongly about this issue, because homeownership is the key to personal wealth in our country. When someone buys a home, they purchase an asset which will grow over time.

I started the Building a Better America Caucus, BABAC, when I arrived in Congress 4½ years ago, because I thought it was important to provide a forum for us to start addressing issues that impact homeownership. One of the objectives of BABAC is to help cultivate an environment where more Americans turn the dream of homeownership into reality.

When I first started my business, I had an old van that used more oil than gas and a cardboard box which held every tool I owned. I started small. Over 30 years, my business grew, but with each passing year, I saw the impact of government on the housing industry. With each year came government laws and regulations making it harder to build homes. The red tape kept increasing costs. In business, these costs are passed on to consumers. Homes kept getting more expensive.

It is very important that Congress start talking about how the government is impacting home prices. In some parts of the country, my district in southern California is one of them, the heavy burden of Federal, State and local mandates is creating a generation of people who cannot afford to live in the communities where they work and grew up. I call these people the new homeless.

Exactly who are these new homeless? In my district, it might be a couple. The husband is a firefighter and the wife is a teacher. They have a good job and they make a good living, but the combined income does not enable them to purchase a median priced home in southern California which costs over

\$300,000 today. This is a national problem, and Congress must work expeditiously to address it.

I encourage all my colleagues to become active members of BABAC so we can do something about the housing affordable crisis in this country.

BABAC provides Members a forum where we can discuss ways Congress can increase homeownership in America. The Congress Building America program provides Members the opportunity to personally help make homeownership a reality for a family in their district.

□ 1245

The Congress Building America program will give every Member of Congress a chance to express their commitment to affordable homeownership by picking up a hammer and nails and building alongside Habitat for Humanity families to make the American Dream of homeownership a reality.

The goal of this resolution is to encourage Members of Congress to participate in Congress Building America events with Habitat homeowner families and local Habitat affiliates in their districts or States during the 108th and 109th Congress. This new initiative is a partnership program between Habitat for Humanity International, the United States Congress, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and national corporate sponsors.

I urge each Member to support this resolution and to personally join with the Habitat for Humanity affiliates in their districts to help low-income families realize the American Dream of homeownership.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is really record-setting. I have not in all my years here seen so much wind up and so little pitch. This goes on quite eloquently and quite accurately about the importance of homeownership, and it talks about the need for affordable housing. It says, "Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing." It says, on the next page, "Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms." It talks a very good game about the importance of housing, and particularly affordable housing; and it delivers virtually nothing.

I have been lamenting for some time the opposition of my Republican colleagues to a housing production program in this country. In many parts of this country you will not get affordable housing, as we define that, that is housing for lower-income working people, middle-income people in some areas, unless there is some element of subsidy. We are not talking about the Federal Government simply building the housing. We are talking about a whole range of cooperative programs,

many of them private-public cooperations. But it is clearly the case that unless the Federal Government contributes something, you will not get affordable housing.

Now, my Republican colleagues have been strongly against most production programs, but I see now they have come up with one. It is in this resolution, which I am going to vote for, because I am all in favor of good wishes. I think we should all, at all times, be in favor of things that we should be in favor of. And this resolution is clearly in favor of a lot of things that we should be in favor of. It just does not do anything about them. Does not make them worse. And it does have a production program.

I call Members' attention to page 3, paragraph 3. It says, "During the years of the 108th and 109th sessions of Congress, Members of the Senate and the House should sponsor and construct two homes in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area."

Now, the legislative draftsmanship is perhaps not perfect. I will read that as being two homes each. I assume this does not mean that we should all of us build two homes. And I hope not, because there are people here that I would not want to be near them when they had a hammer or a saw or a drill. So I would not want to have to be in a joint effort to build some of these homes.

So we are talking about two homes each for 4 years. Now, there are 535 Members of Congress. Two homes apiece would be 1,070 homes a year for 4 years. So we now have the affordable housing program of the Republican Party for production: 4,280 homes over the next 4 years in the metropolitan Washington area, D.C. and Fairfax County, although they probably would not get that many, Alexandria, Arlington, parts of Montgomery and maybe more in Prince George's.

Now, 4,280 houses is better than nothing, although I have to say I am willing to do my part; and I have to say this, we are not often sufficiently modest around here, and each of us is supposed to build two houses, but, Madam Speaker, I would not want to live in a house I built. There are some things I think I am good at, some things I am not so good at. The notion of all of us building houses is an interesting one.

Actually, this is motivated both by a desire to do affordable housing, but it also carries out the Republican approach to unions. Because their entire production program would be built by overwhelmingly nonunion labor. There are a couple of Members here who are members of unions, although it is rarely the building trades. My colleague from Boston, the gentleman from Massachusetts, was an iron worker; but he can only do so much. And I do not know how many of the houses would be made out of iron or structural steel or whatever anyway.

So here they have a housing production program, 4,280 houses for the entirety of America, built almost exclusively by nonunion labor, without a penny of Federal Government contribution. Unless we built them during work hours. I suppose if we built them during working hours, when we were getting paid, it would be some Federal contribution. I assume the position is that we do not.

Now, I guess I am a little ambivalent about the notion of unleashing every Member of the House and the Senate to build two houses. I know you cannot comment on Senators, I understand that, Madam Speaker; but I think you can comment on past Senators, and I guess I can say that I am pleased Strom Thurmond will no longer be covered by this. It is a lucky thing we did not pass this last year, because Strom Thurmond would have been charged with building two houses somewhere, and I would want to live in those even less than the ones I would build.

But the problem is not so much with what it says, but with what it does not say. We have not for some time had a program in this country to have Federal resources go for housing production. And in the absence of a housing production program, families will have a hard time getting affordable housing. We have some programs that help. We have the programs that help build housing for the elderly and for the disabled. We have the low-income tax credit, which does a good job; but it is limited. We have the section 8 voucher program which works well in a lot of areas, but the section 8 program does not contribute to production, particularly when we have rulings now that say you can only use a voucher 1 year at a time. No one can build a house on a year-by-year commitment.

So I am all in favor of the goals of this resolution. I just wish it did something other than asking this workforce to go out and build a couple of houses a year to carry it out. We have a terrible crisis in this country with regard to affordable housing. And let me just say, Madam Speaker, that one of the arguments we have when some of us talk about the need for the Federal Government to participate in doing things that are important for the quality of our lives, we are told we should not worry about it, the private economy will take care of it.

The private economy does a great deal. The private economy supplies many of our needs, and a private sector is something we should all work for. But there are some things it will not do. And with the very prosperity of the 1990s, which was so important in helping people achieve so many goals, for many people it made the housing situation worse. Because prosperity is obviously not uniformly distributed. Under the policies now in power, it is even less uniformly distributed than ever, as a conscious choice. But even at its best, prosperity will be uneven.

And many people in this country, in the greater Boston area, in the area

around San Francisco, in Chicago, in many of our great metropolitan areas people whose incomes were somewhat fixed, many of them public employees, teachers, firefighters, police officers, and social workers, and public works people, people on relatively fixed incomes found themselves worse off in the housing market because prosperity drove up the value of many properties, and some people benefited enormously, and some were left behind.

We are told, well, a rising tide will lift all boats. But if you are too poor to afford a boat, the rising tide will go over your head and drown you. And that happened to many people. The very prosperity of the 1990s that were so welcome nationally exacerbated the housing crisis.

That does not mean the government building all the housing is the answer. It does mean that a sensible, well-funded production program, where the government contributes along with the private sector an element of subsidy so that new housing can be built in many parts of the country, is the only way this resolution will be more than just empty rhetoric.

So at this point we only have this resolution. But we will later in the year have a chance to address this, I hope. I hope the committee which brought this out, the Committee on Financial Services, which has jurisdiction over housing, will be allowed by the leadership of this House to formulate a sensible production program and bring it forward. And if we do, we may be able to rescue this resolution from the charge of being just empty rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the author of this resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I thank the House for considering Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Just to depart briefly from my prepared comments, I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts rail against this legislation. It is just absolute proof that no good deed goes unpunished. This is a good idea. This is an idea that is very successful. It is an idea that gives individuals the opportunity to volunteer to help their neighbors to build a home. I suspect even if he may be a ham-handed carpenter that with a good foreman on the job he could learn how to pound nails.

But the point really is this is not about mass-production housing. It is about creating homeownership. Earlier this week, I had the privilege of joining a handful of my neighbors at the home of Nyoka Williams, a participant in the Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative. The Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative is a city-wide effort to expand homeownership opportunities and improve quality of life in Syracuse, my hometown.

We gathered to celebrate the success of the Mini-Grant program, which provides city families with grants and loans to improve their owner-occupied homes. At the ceremony, Ms. Williams reflected on her own hard-fought struggle to purchase a home. This program creates homeowners.

Now, not everybody in this country can afford to own a home, but we ought to be doing everything we can to make that possible, and this program goes a long way.

With Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative's assistance and her hard work, her previously vacant home is now a showcase on the block. And after years of renting substandard apartments, she is thrilled to be able to take care of her aging mother and entertain her multiple grandchildren in her very own home. Ms. Williams told me that homeownership has not only provided her with a quality place to live and to spend time with her family, but has given her a renewed sense of pride in herself and a new level of confidence that she can meet any challenge.

And I can tell you that Ms. Williams wears that sense of pride and accomplishment in a big beautiful smile whenever she talks about her good fortune and her very own home.

Madam Speaker, for many years now, Habitat for Humanity has been working to offer the same level of accomplishment and that sense of pride to thousands of families the world over. By making homeownership affordable and accessible, Habitat has coordinated the construction of thousands of new homes across the United States, relying upon a great deal of donated goods and utilizing a volunteer labor force.

Now, those volunteers can be labor union members or nonlabor union members. The good news is it does not matter. If they are willing to donate their time and hammer, or carry some lumber, or lay some concrete, God bless them. Nobody is going to tell them they cannot do it.

This program has made 50,000 Americans homeowners. I am proud to be a veteran of previous Habitat builds back home in Syracuse, in my home town and here in Washington, where I worked with Members of the House and Senate on two different houses in the Washington, D.C. area. Some of us were more handy than others, but the good news is we worked together. Even in Belfast, Northern Ireland, people of both communities came together, and the Habitat house build provided a vehicle to bring people together. And it does that here too.

It is our hope that every Member of Congress will build a house, all 535 of us, in their districts, through this program. Habitat for Humanity provides affordable quality homes for those currently struggling to achieve the dream of homeownership. There are millions of Americans who could become homeowners if we helped them through this program and the many other programs provided through the housing agency,

through HUD. They support renewed investment efforts in America's cities, and they allow for a better quality of life for all involved.

I urge my colleagues to support S. Con. Res. 43 and encourage their active involvement in the Congress Building America program in the 108th and 109th sessions of Congress. Proudful smiles like Ms. Williams demonstrate just how rewarding homeownership efforts like Habitat for Humanity really are.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I notice on page 4 it says each Congress Building America house should be constructed primarily by Members of the Senate and House, their families and staff. Now, presumably, if we do this, it is voluntarily. But if we pass a bill like this and our staffs do it, it might not be voluntary. We might need an interpretation from you, Madam Speaker, under the bill you have been sponsoring. If our staffs show up to build housing and they have to work overtime, would we pay them overtime or would they get comp time?

So I think we will have to have further interpretation when our staffs report for home building, which some of them probably did not sign up for.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), a very active leader in the fight for affordable housing in our committee.

□ 1300

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and applaud the gentleman for all of the work he has done on affordable housing for this country.

Today we are considering legislation which encourages Members of Congress "to participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States."

I have no problem with this legislation. It would be very nice if Members of Congress worked together to build a few hundred units of affordable housing. The problem is that in the United States of America today, we have a housing crisis, and we do not need a few hundred units of new housing, we need hundreds of thousands of units of new housing. It is not acceptable for people to say it is so nice, we are volunteering our efforts.

Madam Speaker, we have children sleeping out in the street all over America. We have working families working 40 hours a week living in their cars, and Members of Congress building a few hundred housing units might make for good press releases and photos in newspapers, but it does nothing to address the housing crisis in this country.

While the affordable housing crisis in this country deepens, President Bush's proposed housing budget is 63 percent less than it was in 1976 during the last year of the Ford administration. While more than 3 million Americans will ex-

perience homelessness this year, including 1.3 million children, President Bush proposes to eliminate a \$574 million a year program to revitalize public housing and recently refused to fully fund public housing operating expenses. While 4.9 million American families pay more than 50 percent of their limited incomes on housing, President Bush has proposed to block grant the Federal section 8 rental assistance program which would raise rents and jeopardize rental assistance for tens of thousands of families.

While President Bush says he supports expanding homeownership, the reality is that his initiatives have not produced a single home buyer in 2.5 years, and since the President took office, housing foreclosures have increased by 39 percent and home loan delinquencies have increased by 26 percent.

Last year the Bush administration care so much about affordable housing that they worked to defeat legislation that I introduced to provide the tools necessary to construct, rehabilitate and preserve at least 1.5 million affordable housing rental units over the last decade through a national affordable housing trust fund.

Madam Speaker, we are not going to give up. Just a few months ago, I reduced the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund, a proposal that would not only provide real solutions to the affordable housing crisis, but would also lead to the creation of some 1.8 million new jobs and nearly \$50 billion in wages. This legislation currently has 200 tripartisan cosponsors, including 11 Republicans.

This bill currently has 200 tri-partisan cosponsors, including 11 Republicans, and has been endorsed by over 4,000 groups representing labor unions, business leaders, religious organizations, environmental groups, bankers and affordable housing advocates.

At a time when 4.9 million Americans families are paying more than 50 percent of their limited incomes on housing and at least 800,000 people, including 200,000 children, are homeless on any given night, the federal government has a responsibility to correct this crisis.

If the Republican leadership and the Bush Administration truly wanted to "participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States" they would join me in supporting a National Affordable Housing Trust Fund and get this bill signed into law as soon as possible.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) have made. While I stand in strong support of this resolution, and it is a great resolution, great ideas about

what need to be done, but in reality, we need to get serious about the business of doing it.

The Congressional Black Caucus has a program called WOW, With Ownership Wealth, and in my congressional district, we have been going around promoting the purchase of homes by African Americans. We find that many people, once they reach the point where homeownership is in their mind, there is not the availability of homes that they can purchase. When we start talking about incomes of \$25,000 and \$30,000, people cannot purchase a \$250,000 home. There must be affordable homes built.

Just recently a study was done that the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is associated with the organization, pointed out there are 850,000 individuals at the Chicago metropolitan area who live at or near the level of poverty. If these individuals are going to be able to purchase a home, not only must there be mortgage money available, but there also has to be the affordability of a house that they can buy.

Madam Speaker, I support this resolution, strongly suggest that we find ways to implement the concepts of it and make real the idea that people can live in their house by the side of the road, and the only way we will do it is have affordable housing that they are able to purchase.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Financial Services, and a great leader in this field.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in respect for and in support of this resolution. Habitat for Humanity is a wonderful organization, with 1,655 affiliates in all 50 States. Habitat for Humanity has built nearly 150,000 houses worldwide, and it has an ambitious goal of building another 50,000 homes by 2005. So I certainly support their efforts, and I am pleased the House and Senate staff and Members will join Habitat for Humanity in building a couple of homes right here in Washington, D.C.

Yet, even as I congratulate Habitat for Humanity for all of its work, I believe that all of us need to take a broader look at the issues of affordable housing and housing policy generally. We are falling very short of where we need to be in order to make the goal of affordable housing a goal that is obtainable for all Americans. Much more work needs to be done.

The unfortunate reality is that the Bush administration's homeownership record is one of feel-good rhetoric and photo opportunities, not one of substance. When it comes to creating affordable housing and helping to revitalize sustainable community development, the Bush administration is simply missing in action. Only 47.1 percent of African American and Latino communities respectively are homeowners.

Where is the administration's plan to improve percentages to those of other populations?

We need to put a stop to predatory lending to vulnerable consumers. Where is the administration's plan to eliminate predatory lending to consumers who are new to the homeownership process? As Members know, predatory lending is the making of unethical and abusive mortgage loans that include excessive fees, inflated rates and such practices as making loans that the borrower cannot repay. The predatory lending industry has grown significantly over the past 10 years.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to protect homeowners who are subject to predatory practices. Predatory lending affects borrowers of all races and income levels, but such lenders often target elderly homeowners and people of color. For example, borrowers 65 and older are 3 times more likely to hold subprime mortgages than borrowers 35 years of age. Simply put, when it comes to housing, there is much more we need to be doing than just commending Habitat for Humanity for building some housing. For example, we need to adopt legislation that ensures that consumers will pay no penalties when prepaying all or part of a mortgage credit loan balance. We should be working to ensure that there is no financing of credit, life, disability or unemployment insurance on a single premium basis. We also need to protect anyone from knowingly engaging in the practice of flipping a mortgage loan or extension of credit.

We also need policies and practices that will nullify any mortgage or loan contract that does not contain all the written terms of the contract or has blank spaces for such terms to be filled in after the contract is signed.

Mr. Speaker, increasing the supply of affordable housing, protecting consumers from predatory lending and predatory mortgage servicing. This is the housing agenda we need to be pursuing. I urge the Bush administration to join us in this effort.

I commend Habitat for Humanity for its tremendous work and urge all my Colleagues to support this Resolution.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me this time to give me an opportunity to express myself on this resolution.

We obviously are all supportive of the resolution dealing with Habitat for Humanity and encouraging our colleagues to participate in the effort here in the District of Columbia. We are supportive of anything that does decent and affordable housing for people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that we are so perplexed by the President's decision not to go forward with

the Hope VI project by zeroing out Hope VI and saying that Hope VI has apparently served its purpose in this country.

I just came from a meeting with a group of students, one of whom was Ms. Audrey Evans who is a student at North Carolina A&T State University, and without knowing I was coming here, she said I want to commend you on the Hope VI program. She said she was raised in public housing, and our commitment to Hope VI helped to change her life because putting public housing in communities and allowing her to be exposed to people around her who are interested in succeeding educationally and economically and personally is something that has meant so much to her.

Throughout America, we have heard these stories about how successful Hope VI has been. On a bipartisan basis in our committee, just like both of these gentlemen have yielded me time, we are perplexed as to why such a successful program, which coincidentally was a Republican program instituted by Secretary Kemp when he was Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, how could we terminate such a program as this?

We are supportive of this resolution, but we also want this administration to be committed to housing in general in this country.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As I read this resolution, I really did think I was reading the fundamental arguments for the establishment of a national affordable housing trust fund which has been sponsored by over 200 members of this body. So I would like to read just a couple of whereas clauses which explain why I think this resolution sounds like the provisions of the National Housing Trust Fund.

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them; whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States.

That is some of what this resolution says. I fully support and appreciate the efforts of Habitat for Humanity and really agree that they should be applauded and supported. However, this resolution is just another vehicle for Republicans to talk about their non-existent housing agenda. This Congress must allow us to debate and vote on significant housing legislation.

My frustration with my Republican colleagues for failing to bring signifi-

cant housing legislation to the floor and for ignoring the dismal housing and economic outlook in this country is really only compounded by the Republican attempts to clock weak homeowner initiatives by pretending to support the American dream of homeownership.

While the nationwide homeownership rate is approaching 70 percent, the African American and Latino homeownership rate pale in comparison, to about 46 percent; and in the administration's Homeownership Downpayment Assistance Program, they would not even support foreclosure assistance to help these homeowners keep their homes and protect taxpayer investment.

Of the 3.9 million low-income households to be considered working poor, over two-thirds pay 30 percent or more of their income for housing costs, with one-quarter paying over half their incomes. In 39 States, 40 percent or more of renters cannot afford fair market for a 2-bedroom unit, and that is why creating more affordable housing and homeownership should be our focus.

□ 1315

Consistently since the Bush administration has drafted budgets, they seem to negate the promise of homeownership, community investment, and fair, quality housing. This administration continues to cut the HUD budget and fight successful programs such as HOPE VI, section 8, the public housing drug elimination program and the creation of a national affordable housing production program.

I will vote for this resolution, I support it; but I encourage the other side to bring some real housing bills to the floor very soon.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I enjoyed the one comment: "This resolution is here so Republicans can just talk about affordable housing." The gentleman from Massachusetts and I, we do agree on one major issue: there is a huge shortage of affordable housing in this country. I believe we both have a passion in common to try to resolve this problem. Earlier this year, I brought a bill up before our committee on brownfields. Brownfields are contaminated sites within inner cities where the infrastructure is in place and the need for affordable housing is there. The gentleman from Massachusetts has worked hand in hand with me to bring this to the floor; but because of a lack of agreement on his side of the aisle, none to his blame, we are unable to do that because one Member wants to define brownfields using an EPA definition. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I realize that if you do that you eliminate petroleum sites which are 50 percent of the half million sites in this country. So he and I have worked to resolve something and others are giving lip service to this issue.

There has been much talk about subsidies. We deal with section 8 housing and the need for section 8 housing. We come to an agreement that there is a need for that. But in Los Angeles County, we had the housing authority here, I asked them the question of what is your occupancy rate in California, in L.A. County? They said, we are 97 percent occupied. That means 3 percent of the units that are not occupied are under renovation. Basically, they are 100 percent full. They have no available section 8 housing for people to go to. We can increase section 8 vouchers causing more money to chase no product, and all it does is increase the cost of the product.

But there have been things that have been said here today. We need subsidies which we do provide some. The President has come up with a great idea. He said, let us allow people to take section 8 vouchers, up to 12, and apply them as a down payment to buy a home. That is a great idea. I hope the appropriators this year will fund that program. What we are saying is people who have been locked into section 8 housing can now take the money they would have received in 12 months and put it as a down payment to buy a home, so 10 years, 15 or 20 years from now their payment is the same as it is today, not rising as it does in rental housing. We need to create homeownership rather than just create renters in this country.

There has been a comment made about we need a housing production program. We have that in this program. It is called the Building Industry Association. But government does everything it can to stop builders from providing affordable homes in this country. We have so many mandates on builders. I remember 30 years ago when I entered the industry, you could go out within a matter of 2 months and make application on a tract map to build a tract of homes, whether it be five, 10 or 15; and in 60 days you had entitlements, yes or no. They had to do it because on day 59 you were approved by law. I talk to builders today that have been 3, 4, 5, 8, 10 years processing subdivisions trying to provide affordable housing for the people of this country and they cannot get through the process.

I spend more time helping builders with Fish and Wildlife and Army Corps of Engineers issues. One thing I wish the other side of the aisle would agree to do and that is reform the Endangered Species Act. In Colton, California, there is one project that has 3,000 homes on 3,000 acres. They are only wanting to develop about 300-and-something of those acres, but they happen to have a rat on that property. It is called the San Bernardino kangaroo rat. It is becoming extinct. People who love rats want to set aside habitat for these rats, but they always want to set the habitat aside on privately owned property. That means somebody who owns a piece of land, all of a sudden the

government determines that they own habitat that this rat should live on. The problem with the San Bernardino kangaroo rat is it only lives in washes, which means every time it rains during the winter, the little critters drown and the reason they are becoming extinct is the little critters are too stupid to get out of the wash that they are drowning in and go somewhere else. So no matter what we do, those little critters year after year after year are going to continue to be less in population than they are today because they are too stupid to move out of a wash.

There is another great one in California called the Delhi sand-loving fly. I remember years ago when our parents ran this country, we used to swat flies and poison rats. Now we set aside habitat for them on privately owned property. Something is wrong with this country. I think it is incumbent upon us to change it. It is nice to give lip service about affordable housing, and I believe many of my colleagues who spoke today are genuine about a passion; but this resolution allows Members of Congress to actually do something besides give lip service, lean over and pound some nails, finish some concrete, hang some dry wall, put some roofing material on, put some plumbing in, run finish on electrical, paint, hang doors, run casing and base.

We can actually do something besides talk about it. Yes, it is a small gesture; but if you look at the problems we have caused because of the stupid laws and regulations we have placed on the building industry today, anything we do, even if it is small, will help. If we are really talking about helping people get into affordable housing, let us do something genuine about it. More government is not going to solve anything. Yes, more government has created a problem and some believe that government money now should resolve that problem and that is wrong.

If we would just step back at the Federal, State and local level and say, how do we reduce the regulations placed upon the building industry so a person can go out and reasonably buy a piece of property and in a given span of time can build homes instead of 3, 4, 5, 10 years of process. When you take 3 years to get an entitlement, it is costing somebody a lot of money to buy the property and hold it and pay all these consultants to work on the property.

In California, we require builders to go through title 24. That is energy efficiency, which means a home must be airtight, no air infiltration. They even limit it in most fireplaces you can put in that are man-made because they do not want air infiltration in a home. When you have water and no air infiltration, what do you get? Mold. One of the problems we are facing in this country is that insurance companies do not want to write policies because of mold. If we did not have the policies we have today dealing with energy efficiency, perhaps we would not have

some of the mold problems we have in this country.

When we talk about affordable housing, let us talk about it in reality. If you are going to have section 8 housing that is available, you have got to have an affordable move-up marketplace, and it is not there today. People in section 8 housing receiving government assistance cannot afford to move out of that house because there is not an affordable unit for them to move into. So if we really want to help people be able to get out of section 8 housing, to actually attain the rights that we believe they should have of homeownership and the luxury that goes along with that, with building assets and everything else, if we really want to do that, then let us look at the structure we have created. Let us pass a law that says any regulation at the State level or the city level that has any negative impact on the cost of housing must have a cost-benefit analysis and you must be able to determine that it is really beneficial to do that, not just something that makes people hug each other and feel good and pat each other on the back. Let us change the way we do business in this country.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to make sure I understand. The gentleman is proposing that we pass a Federal statute that would say that no local zoning regulation could go into effect?

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I take back my time. What I said is a cost-benefit analysis. If you can do something and determine that there is a benefit in the regulations you are placing on affordable housing, that is fine. But for us to sit here and say, oh, we need to have more government programs and more government funding and yet we do not get to the core problem of affordability, you have to get to the core problem of affordability. There is no difference from us saying, let us, the Federal Government, fund housing but you have got to have everybody in agreement we are even going to put it there.

The problem you have with section 8 housing, and the gentleman from Massachusetts knows this to be a fact himself, is you go to many communities and you say you are going to build low-income housing and the whole community is in an uproar because they do not want it in their community because they start saying, you are going to have gang violence, you are going to have problems, you are going to have transients. They do not want it in their communities.

I am not saying that it is bad; I am saying that is just a fact. It is this NIMBY, not in my backyard attitude. That is a problem we face in this country, unless you will change the laws to where a builder has a reasonable time

to process a subdivision. Yes, let us look at the environmental impact that might be placed on the community of a project; let us look at the environment, if there are any species that are going to be harmed there. But let us do it in a reasonable span of time, not 3, 5, 10 years. I told the gentleman from Massachusetts of a project I owned for 12 years that I finally ended up selling to the city because nobody wanted it built, yet there was not a bit of flora or fauna that was in any way impacted, nor was there a species out there that was on the endangered species list. Let us look at the problem and let us work together to see that we are not overturning local rights, but let us work with the local communities.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman, however, is being inconsistent. I have been critical of the use of local zoning in many cases to block housing proposals, but I do want to be clear. These are local and State laws. The Endangered Species Act is Federal. But most of what the gentleman talked about are local and State laws, and I am asking the gentleman, is he proposing that at the Federal level we pass statutes that regulate and restrict and limit what form local zoning can take, saying that it has to have a cost-benefit analysis, et cetera? I might be interested in joining that, if that is what the gentleman is advocating.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Reclaiming my time, if we look prior to 1948, the tax revenues in this country generally went to cities. It started to change after 1948. The State started taking more and the Federal Government started taking more. About 1972, it got so bad that locals were being deprived of so much money they could no longer afford to put the streets and the sewers and the storm drains in necessary to build homes. Why? Because the Federal Government and the State government got greedy and started taking the money from the people who need it, the cities. What we have done is create a situation where now the tax dollars are not put in the infrastructure; the builder puts in the infrastructure. Plus he pays for all the local mitigation and impacts that the community might face in some fashion, even if it is a signal 5 miles down the road that might be impacted in some fashion because this tract of 80 people living in it might impact that intersection.

But we have got to look at what government has done. Government has changed to such a degree that we have taken the money, become greedy; and now we do not want to address the problems we can address.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con. Res. 43, which expresses the sense of Congress that this legislature should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States.

The goal of this resolution is to encourage members of Congress to participate in Con-

gress Building America build events with Habitat homeowner families and local Habitat affiliates in their districts or states during the 108th and 109th Congress, and I urge each member's support of this resolution and to personally join with the Habitat for Humanity affiliates in their districts to help low-income families realize the American dream of homeownership.

I urge my colleagues to endorse this resolution that will not only express the sense of Congress in support of increased affordable homeownership opportunities, but will result in the building of hundreds of new homes for low-income and minority families across the country.

The fact that June is National Homeownership Month makes the scheduling of this concurrent resolution especially appropriate. For the vast majority of families, homeownership serves as an engine of social mobility and the path to prosperity. We are blessed to live in a country where every citizen—regardless of race, creed, color, or place of birth—has the opportunity to own a home of their own. And, new homeowners can create wealth for their families for generations to come, while also helping transform neighborhoods and communities.

The home has long held a place of mythic stature in the hearts and minds of Americans, as many of this country's forebears considered homeownership a key component of a democratic society. Homeownership creates stakeholders within a community and inspires civic responsibility. It offers children a stable living environment that influences their personal development in many positive ways—including improving their performance in school. Studies by housing experts show a clear link between an increase in homeownership and a decrease in crime rates.

In the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity this year, I plan to continue working hard to explore new ways to put people on the path to homeownership, so they can realize its many benefits. The Financial Services Committee already marked-up three housing bills last month by voice vote: H.R. 23, The Tornado Shelters Act, H.R. 1614, the HOPE VI Program Reauthorization and Small Community Main Street Rejuvenation and Housing Action of 2003, and H.R. 1276, The American Dream Downpayment Act.

The American Dream Downpayment Act, introduced by KATHERINE HARRIS of Florida, is a vital initiative in the creation of new homeowners. This bill would provide \$200 million in grants to help homebuyers with the downpayment and closing costs. This has the potential of assisting 40,000 families annually achieve the dream of homeownership and would make available subsidy assistance, averaging \$5,000, to help low-income, first-time home buying families.

In addition to moving these important pieces of legislation, the Subcommittee is in the midst of holding a series of hearings examining the current operation and administration of the Section 8 Housing Choice voucher program, which provides rental assistance to more than 1.8 million families. While the concept of the program remains sound, the program has often been criticized for its inefficiency. More than a billion dollars are recaptured from the program every year, despite long waiting lists for vouchers in many communities. The rising cost of the Section 8 program and some of the administrative concerns have caused many in

Congress and the Administration to conclude that the program is in need of reform. In the coming months, I look forward to hearing the different perspectives from our many distinguished witnesses as we continue to discuss ways to improve America's communities and strengthen housing opportunities for all citizens.

Congress Building America will enable Members of Congress to express their commitment to affordable homeownership by picking up hammers and nails and building alongside Habitat for Humanity families to make the American dream of homeownership a reality. This initiative is a hands-on approach to making affordable homeownership a reality, one family at a time, one community at a time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con. Res. 43, which expresses the sense that Congress should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States. I urge my colleagues to not only join me in supporting this resolution, but to also join the thousands of Americans who volunteer their time to provide for those less fortunate.

This resolution calls upon Congress to support activities to provide decent homes for Americans and recognizes an organization that has been working towards improving housing conditions for over 27 years now. Of course, I'm talking about Habitat for Humanity, an organization that has built nearly 150,000 affordable houses for families worldwide and is planning to complete another 50,000 homes by 2005. In fact, Habitat for Humanity just dedicated two homes in my district in Mansfield, Ohio on Father's Day and more houses are being dedicated all over Ohio on an ongoing basis. Several local businesses and charitable organizations also help support the building of these homes. This kind of effort provides a great example of what we can accomplish when communities come together to assist their residents.

The resolution outlines a plan for a new initiative called Congress Building America, which calls upon the Members of Congress to demonstrate the importance of volunteer work by working with Habitat for Humanity and other contributing organizations to construct homes across the nation. This simple, but adequate, housing for less fortunate families, symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership. Under this model, homeowners contribute sweat equity toward their new home, building it alongside trained volunteers. The new homeowner then has the opportunity to buy the home with a no interest mortgage. The average cost of these homes is \$53,000 with a monthly payment of around \$266. In most cases, the payment is even lower than what they were paying for substandard rental units.

Beyond the obvious benefit to the new homeowner, Habitat's work to provide safe, decent and affordable shelter for thousands of needy families adds to the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all Americans.

One of the greatest attributes of organizations such as Habitat is that the benefits of service go both ways. Not only are families in need of housing receiving benefits, but volunteers often find their service extremely rewarding as well. It is great to see so many young

people serving their fellow citizens by volunteering to help those less fortunate. Over 10,000 students have signed up to help Habitat for Humanity build houses through their Collegiate Challenge program breaking down barriers to homeownership and breaking down the stereotype of a typical college kid on spring break at the same time.

Clearly, there is still much work to be done. We are focusing our efforts to increase the availability of affordable housing in communities across the country. Today we are here to reaffirm that commitment and recognize all the hard work that has already been done. I would therefore like to take this opportunity during National Homeownership Month to thank those organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity, that work to help families achieve the dream of homeownership.

I would also like to commend the Housing Subcommittee, chaired by Representative BOB NEY, today for its hard work to break down the barriers to homeownership faced by too many Americans. By the end of this week the subcommittee will have held 11 hearings as part of its effort to pursue an aggressive legislative agenda. At the top of that list is the American Dream Downpayment Act which will provide \$200 million in grant funds assisting approximately 40,000 low-income families with down payment and closing costs on their first homes.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in participating in the Congress Building America program and look forward to the many continued efforts which will build communities across the nation and help thousands of American families buy homes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, the resolution that expresses the Congress's support for the Habitat For Humanity and the good work this great organization does for American families throughout the Nation.

I am proud to say that this wonderful institution was born in Americus, GA, within the district that I am so privileged to represent. Since its inception, this model of compassion and commitment to humanity has spawned similar groups, and has changed the way many Americans view the problem of homelessness and derelict housing. At this very moment somewhere in America, a home is being built by the Habitat For Humanity. The number of volunteers now exceeds 200,000 and is growing. More than 100,000 homes have been built and renovated, and more are being completed across the country at a rate of 1,000 per month. But we can do even more.

This resolution encourages Members of Congress to participate in "Congress Building America" events with local Habitat For Humanity affiliates in their home districts that will continue and increase the homebuilding effort all across America.

Mr. Speaker, Habitat For Humanity works. What seemed like a dream to those who had the vision in Americus so many years ago, is now becoming a reality. Decent housing for every American—thanks to Habitat For Humanity, this is an idea whose time has come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

GARY G. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 43.

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. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

---

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 342, KEEPING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SAFE ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 276 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 276

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 342) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to make improvements to and reauthorize programs under that Act, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a standard rule for consideration of conference reports and waives all points of order against consideration of the conference report.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, the process of reauthorizing the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention Treatment Act completes a promise made to the American people that was begun in the 107th Congress. Unfortunately, the last Congress adjourned before consensus was reached between the two bodies on this very important issue. By taking up the conference report on the reintroduced legislation today, Congress is demonstrating an ongoing commitment to ensuring that programs to prevent child abuse, neglect, and family violence can continue to work and to protect American families.

The underlying conference report that we are debating maintains important Federal resources for identifying

and addressing issues of domestic violence. It supports efforts to ensure that the current programs designed to address these issues are operating effectively and efficiently, and that they promote the prevention of child abuse before these heinous acts can occur.

The conference report retains language promoting partnerships between child protective services and private and community-based organizations, including education and mental health systems, to provide child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment services. It improves the training, recruitment, and retention of individuals who are capable of providing services to children and families. It also increases the availability of casework supervisors for oversight and consultation, while simultaneously improving public education on the role of the child protective services system and appropriate reporting of suspected incidents of child abuse and neglect, to reduce the number of false or malicious allegations.

This conference report requires States to have provisions and procedures for administering criminal background checks to prospective foster and adoptive parents, and other adult relatives and nonrelatives residing in the household, and helps to improve the training opportunities and requirements of child protective services personnel to ensure their active collaboration with families, and their knowledge of legal duties with these individuals to protect children's individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also requires States to implement policies and procedures to address the needs of infants born and identification as being affected by illegal substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal drug exposure, including the requirement that healthcare providers involved in the delivery or care of such infants notify child protective services of the occurrence of such conditions in infants. It then requires the development and planning of safe care for such infants.

Lastly, the conference report retains language that expands priority services to infants and young children who are born with a life-threatening condition or with other very special medical needs, to ensure that these special needs are met and that these special children have a chance in life.

If there is one issue upon which every single Member of this institution can agree, regardless of his or her political belief, it should be the need to prevent child abuse and domestic abuse. These atrocities and often silent crimes do lasting damage to the lives of individuals and the moral fabric of our society. There exists a responsibility incumbent upon each of us to enact laws that protect the most vulnerable in our society, and this conference report will go a very long way to accomplish that exactly that noble and moral goal.

I am pleased to note that the House version of this legislation, H.R. 14, easily passed through its committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, earlier this year and then through the House by voice vote. Today's conference report should continue to enjoy widespread and overwhelming bipartisan support as it has already enjoyed tremendous support throughout the child abuse and family violence prevention advocacy communities.

I would ask each of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to demonstrate their commitment to American families, to American communities, and to America's future by supporting this conference report. In particular today, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the House sponsor of this legislation; and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for their hard work in producing this conference report. I would also like to take this moment to commend the conferees from both bodies that have labored to produce this fine product.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying conference report for the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act. My colleagues know that the rules for conference reports in the House are typically closed, and today's rule is reflective of the longstanding tradition in the House to bring conference reports to the floor in a similar fashion.

Mr. Speaker, every time a child is abused or neglected, the whole human race suffers. With that sobering thought in mind, I support the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act. I support this conference report, because most States are facing severe budget deficits, and this is the only Federal legislation that targets child abuse and neglect. I support this conference report because States are dependent on Federal money to meet the increasing demand for community child abuse prevention programs. But realize this legislation does not begin to solve the overwhelming financial problems that the States are currently experiencing. In fact, critics of this bill including the director of the National Child Abuse Coalition say that there is a \$2.5 billion spending gap between the amount currently allocated towards prevention and protection and the amount required to handle this problem effectively.

The statistics on child abuse and neglect in this country are heart-wrench-

ing. The Department of Health and Human Services estimated that in 2001, 903,000 children in this country were victims of abuse or neglect. This figure represents an 11 percent increase from the previous year, and many child advocates say the stress of a bad economy and unemployment could be two reasons for the increase.

This bill includes funding for training and preventative programs for social workers and families and encourages partnerships between State child protective services and community organizations. It also requires foster parents and adoptive parents to undergo criminal background checks and mandates that States expand child abuse services to children born with drug-related problems.

Child abuse and neglect is everyone's problem and it affects us both morally and financially. The cost of training and preventative programs will be offset later when children who might have been burdens on society grow into upstanding citizens. From a financial perspective, the costs of child abuse and neglect to our society as a whole are staggering. Studies have documented the link between abuse and neglect in childhood with medical, emotional, psychological and behavioral disorders in adulthood. Those who are abused as children are more likely to suffer from depression, alcoholism, and drug abuse.

The abused are also more likely to become juvenile delinquents and are 29 percent more likely to become criminals. Using that estimate, 36,000 of the children who were victims of abuse or neglect in 2001 can or may become criminals.

I certainly hope that the work we are doing in this conference report will help curb this number and help those who need it. However, if we are going to come to the floor today and talk about child abuse and neglect, we will be remiss to not talk about the child neglect that occurred last week in this very Chamber when Republicans in this body refused to extend the child tax credit to more than 12 million children living in low-income families without attaching a significant cost to the bill that would have provided for those 12 million children.

Frankly, it baffles me how the rhetoric of Republicans in this body rarely meet the reality of their policies. The All-American Tax Relief Act, which passed this House last week was filled with tax cuts that benefit the more well off in our society more than six times as much as they do the needy. The bill was another tax cut to the wealthy that further drives our country into debt and deficit spending, and it lacked even the slightest bit of fiscal responsibility. In truth, the child tax credit failed to provide relief to more than 12 million children who are growing up in low-income families. In truth, families making between \$10,500 and \$26,625 were excluded from this tax relief, including 1 million children of U.S. Armed Forces personnel. Perhaps

when Republicans talk about all Americans, they are really talking about all Americans in the upper tax brackets.

Mr. Speaker, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson noted, "A Nation as compassionate as ours should ensure that no child is a victim of abuse or neglect. The number of children that are being abused and neglected in this country is an unacceptable daily tragedy." Indeed, Secretary Thompson is correct.

But while this body helps communities fight child abuse and neglect throughout the country, we ought to first fight it right here in the House of Representatives. That we do not, Mr. Speaker, is an unacceptable daily tragedy.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the issue we have before us, this rule, this conference report that we are working on, really does talk about ways in which we can go and improve the lives of millions of children, where we can help families. Families, many times single parents, who are under the stress and strain of attempting to go to work, raise their family, meet their obligations in the community, to their schools, need some help, and I think that that is exactly what this bill does. It does it in a way that community-based organizations can become involved in the life and the opportunity to make not only their neighborhoods and their schools and their communities is safer and better, but they did it in a way that is a partnership.

This administration, this President, supports this. This administration, our President, when President Bush was the Governor of Texas, worked extensively in Texas across Texas in poor communities to try to make the lives better of children to provide them an opportunity to grow up and not only be in safe neighborhoods, but also have safety in their schools. So I think that the underlying legislation in this conference report is fabulous. It does a lot of things to make sure that as a Member of Congress, that all of us as Members of Congress, that we can become engaged in things that we not only can hold our head up high about but we can mentor with our President to make sure that people see this Congress as a caring group of men and women who not only want to ensure the success of people who many of whom we will never know their names but the children who live their lives and are prepared for the future.

I think that in the scheme of things this is a question that comes about not just to Members of Congress but as a demand on this country. The demand on our country is do America's greatest days lie in our future? Are we doing those things throughout the 40 some weeks that we are here in Washington, D.C. away from our families, are we handling the business of the people to

make sure that we make life better? And I think that answer is yes. Today the underlying legislation is yet another example of this Congress working together with this President to make sure that America's greatest days lie in our future because we are active, engaged, and involved with our communities and with people back home.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I yield to the gentlewoman from California, I would like to respond to my good friend and colleague by indicating that the President's remarks were to pass the Senate bill, and what we did last week was force a conference which is going to delay the tax cuts for the 12 million persons about whom I spoke earlier.

□ 1345

That is a reality, and, to my way of thinking, that is, in some respects, uncaring. It certainly is not compassionate. Everybody that is wealthy, including those of us here in Congress, will get our tax benefits, but many of the persons about whom I speak, including some in the military, will not receive a dime this year by virtue of the actions that we took last week.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who has been a leader in the fight for protecting children.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today as we stand here and discuss the conference report on the Keeping Our Children and Families Safe Act, I find it ironic that this week the Republican leadership can find it in their hearts to provide much-needed funding to prevent child abuse, which is decent and necessary, but last week they could not provide critical funding for low-income children without voting for additional tax breaks for the rich. These are the very children from low-income families who are statistically likely to suffer from child abuse, perhaps because of frustration piled on families struggling to make ends meet. This week, the Republicans care about children; last week, they did not. What kind of message is this?

The Republican's child tax credit bill, which the House debated last week, was a squandered opportunity to invest in all of our children and their families. We missed the chance to pass a child tax credit bill which would immediately grant our Nation's hard-working families their fair share of the tax credit.

The families I am talking about are those with dedicated workers that work long hours at low pay, who pay taxes and earn less than \$26,000 a year. It is unfortunate that Republicans believe these children and families do not contribute enough to deserve a break, a break now, like higher income families will get.

Republican actions last week left me no doubt that Republican priorities are dead wrong. Last week the House Republicans should have followed the other body and brought a child tax credit bill before us that would help children now, without burdening them with a tax debt later in life. But, according to the majority leader, "If we are going to do it, we should get something in exchange. If we give people a tax break that don't pay taxes, it is welfare."

Well, Mr. Speaker, these families do pay taxes. They are not seeking welfare. They are seeking the same acknowledgment for their hard work as the rich received in the Republican tax package. They deserve tax relief at the same time as other American families. Instead, this supposed party of "compassionate conservatism" has exploited the child tax credit issue to pass even more tax cuts for their wealthy friends. Instead of bringing up the other body's child tax credit bill costing \$3.5 billion with offsets to fully pay for it, they passed a bill costing over \$80 billion not paid for.

Mr. Speaker, this is at a time when America's Federal deficit will exceed \$400 billion, which, by the way, will be paid for by our children, their children, and their children, and on down the line.

Mr. Speaker, our priority must be putting money in the hands of working Americans while keeping our fiscal house in order. That way we can create jobs and build a strong economy. We are helping our children today by protecting them from child abuse, but being poor is abuse of another kind.

Mr. Speaker, children are 25 percent of the population of this Nation, but they are 100 percent of our Nation's future.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), from the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do think it is unfortunate that when we are here to debate a bill on child abuse prevention, that we get into a debate about a legitimate difference of opinion as to tax policy. I think that that is unfortunate.

But, be that as it may, I also would say ironically I think it is unfortunate to hear the minority party constantly talking about their hatred of deficits, when every single subcommittee markup of any kind I have been in for the last several months, it is the other party trying to spend more money, more money, more money, and us trying to hold the line.

Let us talk about the rule before us. I rise in support of the rule, which I think is a fair rule, but I also rise in strong support of the bill.

I would like to talk about a particular provision that I worked very hard to get in in the Committee on Education and Workforce, and which I

think will do a tremendous amount to actually prevent child abuse, which is what we want to do.

What it does is it says that we look at the causes, the root causes, of child abuse. When you look for the root causes of child abuse to try to prevent it, you find this constant association between abusers of children and abusers of substance. We find it over and over again. Parents who are caught in abusive cycles with drugs and alcohol bring their problems to bear on their children, with often very devastating results in terms of physical brutality against children, sexual abuse of children and psychological abuse of children.

What we noticed, and I bring to bear on this experience my own time spent as a child protective service worker in my home of Bucks County, what we find is that children are born in hospitals every day in this country, and it as clear as can be they are born to mothers who are addicted. These are women who come to the hospitals and bear children who either suffer from fetal alcohol syndrome or they suffer from the systemic presence of a drug or actually have what is called neonatal abstinence syndrome. The child is in withdrawal from the drug. It is a pretty good indicator that this child may be returning to a home where it is not safe.

We have wrestled as a society with how do you protect these children. We do not want to necessarily deem the mothers as having abused the child by virtue of their abuse of the substance. We want to provide intervention, but how do you do that?

What this underlying conference committee report says is that when children appear in a hospital and are delivered and have these symptoms of substance abuse apparent, that the mandated reporters, the health care providers, must notify the child protective service agency, and that child protective service agency then must come in and make sure that there is a safe plan of care for the child.

It does not say that it finds abuse necessarily, it does not say that it finds dependency, it just says we need to intervene, we need to talk with the parents of this child and find out how they intend to overcome their own personal issues so that they can be prepared to nurture this vulnerable child.

I think this provision will go in a tremendous way to provide intervention for young children before they are ever subject to abuse, and help not only that child, but help the mother certainly and the father involved as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and thank the staffs of the committees that worked with us in the House and Senate, and the Committee on Rules for providing a rule under which this conference report can be considered.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield, I will just respond to my friend from Pennsylvania, who is an extremely thoughtful Member of this body, when he cites the fact that Democrats want to spend. Let me isolate that on the child tax credit: Democrats did want to spend the \$3.5 billion that the United States Senate wanted to spend, and each nickel of it was offset. Toward that end, I would urge that that kind of spending rounds to all of our benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss keeping children and families safe, I cannot help but be reminded of a popular song that Marvin Gaye used to sing, and the words went sort of like this. He says, "Who will save the children? Who is willing to try? Who will save a world that is destined to die? Save the babies."

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about protecting families and saving children and refuse to provide a meager tax credit for those at the bottom of the barrel, for those who can barely survive, who can barely make it, it seems to me we are being contradictory.

It is abusive in my mind when we refuse to fully fund education so that every child can have a meaningful head start, to get a grip and a handle on life. It is abusive when we leave children out of being protected so that they can have the kind of health care that they need. And it is certainly abusive that we have 2.7 million people who have lost their jobs in the last 2 years and cannot find a way to really make it. And while I agree that programs and activities are always good and meaningful and beneficial, policies are even better.

I would hope that as we try and find these ways to protect our children, that which would protect their families by giving them a meaningful opportunity to earn a living, to have a job, to have the monies that are needed so that they are not frustrated and resort to behavior that causes them, in many instances, to abuse children.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask, who will save the world? Who is willing to try? Who will save a world that is destined to die? Let us save the children.

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

Mr. Speaker, hearing the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania speak about children, about the things that we encounter and learn from time about tragedies that occur in people's lives with women who have problems along life, either drugs or alcohol, and also at the same time at which they are birthing babies and carry life within them, and the impact that it has on those children, not just at birth but throughout their life, it is a stunning problem in America.

But to hear the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania speak about the great parts about this bill, about how this Congress can reach out, how we as a government can keep working with local communities to bring out the best, not only in their interaction with these mothers that are at risk, but also child abuse victims, it is all important.

I am hopeful we can also learn a lot from the things we have learned over the last few years about people who perpetrate crimes upon children, the identification of those kinds of people, so that communities can do a better job spotting these people and protecting their children. That is what this bill is about. That is the good part of what this bill is about.

I appreciate both these gentleman for coming and telling their stories, not only about why they support this bill, but why this rule is fair and important for us to pass and this conference report. Let us get it to the President and let the President continue to do the things for the American people that he did for the people of Texas when he was Governor.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to taking care of children, I just wonder, and pardon me for asking, what \$1.1 trillion in the original tax cut during the President's administration and the \$350 billion that we passed recently, in addition to the tack-on to the child tax credit, they ran it up to \$82 billion, I wonder what those funds could possibly have done for the children of America? I, for one, would have preferred to spend it on them, rather than on rich people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to 2½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a continuing fighter and champion for children.

□ 1400

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would authorize \$312 million for several programs that seek to prevent child abuse, expand adoption opportunities, assist abandoned infants, and prevent family violence; good goals, good values, good measures. Child abuse is an important issue. It has many, many manifestations. It is attributable to many causes, including, and let me just mention, there is a pending issue in this body, a piece of unfinished business that pertains to our Nation's children; and, if you will, our delaying on this issue directly abuses American children.

What we need to do is to restore the child tax credit to the 6.5 million families this Republican leadership continues to leave behind. That is child abuse. The families of 12 million children generally earn minimum wage. They are tax-paying families. They de-

serve tax relief like every other family. They have bills to pay, mouths to feed, children to care for, just like every other family. And with the economy stuck in a rut, they cannot go to bed at night knowing whether their job will even be there for them the week after next.

These families pay taxes. They make between \$10,500 and \$26,600 a year. They pay taxes, payroll taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes, property taxes. And they pay a greater share of their income in taxes than Enron did; and for the last 5 years, I say to my colleagues, Enron paid zero taxes. There are lots of individuals who are getting the benefit of \$93,000 worth of tax cuts every year, those who are the 184,000 millionaires in this country. I will bet some of them have not paid all of the taxes that they were supposed to have been paying all of these years.

That is why what this House needs to do is to take up the other body's child tax credit legislation, legislation that was denied a simple up or down vote in the House of Representatives.

Let me be clear. The majority has said that these 6.5 million families are not their priority. What they tried to do last week is, in essence, they passed a bill here which would kill the opportunity for the \$3.5 billion to address this issue and it would be taken care of. I would just quote the Committee on Ways and Means chairman. He says he is going to be heavily focused on a different issue and that they would be surprised if a conference between the House and Senate could begin this week. They are going to kill this piece of legislation because they do not really care about the 6.5 million families or the 12 million children.

Mr. Speaker, let us do the right thing. Let us address this issue. Let us end this kind of child abuse.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), one of our bright young Republican Members.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit, of course, as a freshman legislator, I am here to speak in favor of the rule for the conference agreement to S. 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003, and to speak in favor of the overall piece of legislation. But I stand here and I am listening to the other side and all of the discussion I hear is about a tax bill, and it just makes me wonder if the speakers from the other side plan to vote against this bill, if they are opposed to keeping children and families safe for the foreseeable future.

I am, as most of my colleagues know, a physician Member, Mr. Speaker, of this body; and, in particular, I am an OB-GYN doctor. As such, over the past 28 years, I have delivered over 5,000 precious children. Unfortunately, I wish I could say they were all born healthy and well and in the best of circumstances, but unfortunately, some

were not. I think that my passion for this type of legislation, for protecting children and making sure that every child has an opportunity to be well born and in a healthy environment and going into a healthy family situation, that is what this legislation is all about.

We can talk about the child tax credit and tax issues ad infinitum, but we have already had that debate. What we are talking about here today on the floor of the House is this conference committee report and the reauthorization of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Adoption Opportunities Program, the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act. That is what this debate is about. I would hope and trust that the Members of the other side will support unanimously this legislation, because we desperately need to protect those of our society, the most precious and vulnerable members of our society; and that is what this great piece of bipartisan legislation is all about.

I am very proud to serve on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and to serve under my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who brings this bill to us, this reauthorization. It was an honor, it was an honor indeed for this freshman Member of Congress to be appointed to the conference committee on this bill. In fact, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) said to me, he had been here 10 years before having an opportunity to be appointed to a conference committee.

So it is indeed a privilege. I think it shows a lot of respect for me as a physician Member and someone who is often in that delivery room seeing these children who may be very possibly born in a situation where the mom has been on substance abuse or drugs during the pregnancy and we, many times, are highly suspicious of that situation because of the condition of the child, the irritability of the child during the physical examination. These children have a certain physical appearance which is very suggestive in some instances of alcohol or substance abuse. And to just simply go from that delivery room to the next one or the next one, or go from there to a surgical procedure, and then back to the medical office where you might see an additional 30 patients a day would be unconscionable.

So this bill calls for, among other things, reporting these instances. I cannot tell my colleagues how supportive I am of this legislation, and I am proud of the leadership for bringing it to us.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), my good friend who has been a continuing champion for children in this body and in his previous life before coming here.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Flor-

ida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, for yielding me this time.

The underlying bill here I think reflects not only bipartisanship, but our common set of values. It is the right approach to how to protect our children.

As the brother of a sister who is adopted, I applaud the efforts that are reflected here and the attempt here. But that bipartisanship, also those common set of values that we come together on, is in sharp contrast to what was done on the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, the other day *The New York Times* reported that in Iraq right now, 200,000 Iraqis are getting \$20 a day who do not show up for work. Mr. Speaker, 200,000 Iraqis, \$20 a day who do not show up for work. I come from Chicago. We know something about no-show jobs. We think they are a good thing, periodically. But that stands in stark contrast to the 200,000 active duty troop members who are over there putting their lives on the line who will not get the full child tax credit. Now, where in our common values do we respect the people of Iraq, give them 20 bucks a day who do not show up for work, and yet, to our troops who are over there in Afghanistan and Iraq, whose families are only getting \$450 per child tax credit, but not the full \$1,000. Where in our common set of values do we say that is the right thing to do?

Over the weekend the AP ran a story that Halliburton's bid for the oil drilling and oil work that they are doing in Iraq originally for \$77 million is now running double. It was a no-bid contract and Halliburton, in the year of 2001, did not pay any Federal income taxes and, in fact, got an \$85 million rebate. Last week when we were debating the child tax credit, some people described welfare as the full refundable credit; and I have a description of welfare, it is known as corporate welfare, that was done in Halliburton's case.

We here in Congress earn \$12,800 a month. That is equivalent to what some of these families earn in a full year who are worthy of this child tax credit.

So I applaud the efforts that were done here to reflect our values and to take care of our children. I applaud the work done here on this bill; but I want to remind our colleagues, this bill's success comes from not only our bipartisanship but working on a common set of values. We need now to come together, come together, work on the conference, Democrats and Republicans, produce a bill, because as July approaches, some families will get this tax cut and other families, 12 million children, 6.5 million families who work full-time, sometimes more than 40 hours a week, will not be getting that tax credit.

Now, originally this bill was passed to get a tax cut to get the economy moving. It was in there in the Senate when they went to conference, but when the Vice President showed up, somehow it got dropped. We all have an

obligation from the White House to the Senate to the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, to work together to give these middle-class families a tax cut.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the close of this matter, I will urge that Members pay attention to a request on the previous question, and I will urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule, and my amendment will provide that as soon as the House passes the conference report, it will take from the Speaker's table and immediately consider the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1307, the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act. My amendment will also add to H.R. 1307 the text of H.R. 1308, as passed by the Senate, which restores the refundable child tax credit that was removed from the Republican tax bill passed last month.

This will allow the House to combine these two Senate-passed bills and immediately send them back to the Senate and then, hopefully, on to the President's desk for his signature. If this happens, we can begin helping America's lower- and modest-income families right away, and we can give tax relief to those members of the military who are bravely fighting for this Nation as we speak.

Is it not about time we started giving tax breaks to those Americans who really need it? And is it not about time we put an end to legislation that has no chance of becoming law?

Last week, the President said he would sign H.R. 1308, as it was passed by the Senate, and restore the refundable tax credit to those families making between \$10,000 and \$26,000. H.R. 1308, as amended by the Senate, will provide immediate tax relief to America's hard-working, but struggling, families by extending the child tax credit to 6.5 million low-income working families and nearly 12 million additional children. This measure will provide help to the families of 8 million children whose parents serve in the military or are veterans. It will also help families of soldiers in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan by extending the child tax credit to many of them.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1307 will also help our brave men and women serving in the military. It will help with travel costs for those called up for the National Guard and Reserves, and it will provide benefits for the families of the Columbia astronauts.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can combine and then consider these two important tax relief bills as they passed in the Senate and rush them back to the Senate. Let us not let tax relief for these two important and deserving segments of our society wither on the vine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can consider tax relief that can actually become law and really help those most in need of tax relief.

I want to emphasize that a "no" vote will not prevent the House from considering the conference report for this very important legislation, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act. It will allow us to consider the Senate-passed versions of the refundable child tax credit and the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act, in addition to this important conference.

□ 1415

However, a yes vote will stop us from voting on this package of true tax relief for lower income Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to vote no on the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for his support of this conference report, S. 342, Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a good debate today. We have talked about the children of this country. We have talked about our communities. We have talked about our schools. We have talked about the desire that we have as this United States Congress, this administration, President George W. Bush and the kind and gracious leadership of this House, including our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), to time after time take time out of their schedule not only to talk about children, children that are the future of this country and will make a difference, but also that these three gentleman, as leaders of our country, take time to make sure that this administration and the laws of this country are there to protect children, the most vulnerable part of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what this will do. This conference report will go to help people. It will strengthen our communities. It will strengthen community-based organizations who work in a way that we need them to become efficient and be efficient and to offer these services.

I am proud of what we are doing. I am proud of what this Congress is doing, and Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 276 the Rule governing debate on S. 342, the "Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003." This

rule waives all points of order against the Conference Report and its consideration.

Just last week, this Chamber vigorously debated the Child Tax Credit bill. The Republican members of the House of Representatives refused to adopt the Senate-passed tax bill that would have provided relief to 12 million children of hard-working American families. My Democratic colleagues offered a substitute to aid America's children but it was voted down. We have still not passed a Child Tax Credit for America's low-income children.

Now, we prepare to debate the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003. Another bill that is beneficial to America's children by taking strong steps to prevent child abuse. This bill governs dissemination of information about abused children, expands valuable research programs, authorizes grant programs, and many other valuable programs.

The Keeping Children and Families Safe Act was an opportunity to redress the failures of this body in our failure to pass the Child Tax Credit bill last week. By passing this rule, we continue to neglect and jeopardize the welfare of America's children and families, by not immediately passing the Senate Child Tax Credit bill so the President can immediately sign the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Rule governing debate on the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act. I find it ironic that the title of the bill is the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act, and yet will have not passed real Child Tax Credit. This rule jeopardizes America's children, bill for America's most vulnerable children.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES 276

RULE ON CONFERENCE FOR KEEPING CHILDREN & FAMILIES SAFE ACT

At the end of the resolution insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Immediately after disposition of the conference report, the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1307) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence and to restore the tax exempt status of death gratuity payments to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 1308 shall be considered as pending without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adopting H. Res. 276, if ordered; suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 171; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 658 with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 200, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Fossella	Miller, Gary
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Murphy
Baker	Gallegly	Musgrave
Ballenger	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Gibbons	Ney
Barton (TX)	Gilchrest	Northup
Bass	Gillmor	Norwood
Beauprez	Gingrey	Nunes
Bereuter	Goode	Nussle
Biggert	Goodlatte	Osborne
Bilirakis	Goss	Ose
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Otter
Blackburn	Graves	Oxley
Blunt	Green (WI)	Paul
Boehlert	Greenwood	Pearce
Boehner	Gutknecht	Pence
Bonilla	Harris	Peterson (PA)
Bonner	Hart	Petri
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Boozman	Hayes	Pitts
Bradley (NH)	Hayworth	Platts
Brady (TX)	Hefley	Pombo
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Porter
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Portman
Ginny	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Burgess	Hoekstra	Putnam
Burns	Hostettler	Quinn
Burr	Houghton	Radanovich
Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Ramstad
Buyer	Hunter	Regula
Calvert	Hyde	Rehberg
Camp	Isakson	Renzi
Cannon	Issa	Reynolds
Cantor	Istook	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Janklow	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chocola	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Coble	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Keller	Ryun (KS)
Collins	Kelly	Saxton
Cox	Kennedy (MN)	Schrock
Crane	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Sessions
Culberson	Kingston	Shadegg
Cunningham	Kirk	Shaw
Davis, Jo Ann	Kline	Shays
Davis, Tom	Knollenberg	Sherwood
Deal (GA)	Kolbe	Shimkus
DeLay	LaHood	Shuster
DeMint	Latham	Simmons
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourrette	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, M.	Leach	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Linder	Souder
Dunn	LoBiondo	Stearns
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Sullivan
Emerson	Manzullo	Sweeney
English	McCotter	Tancredo
Everett	McCrery	Tauzin
Feeney	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Ferguson	McInnis	Terry
Flake	McKeon	Thomas
Fletcher	Mica	Thornberry
Foley	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Tiberti

Toomey	Wamp	Wilson (NM)
Turner (OH)	Weldon (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Upton	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Vitter	Weller	Young (AK)
Walden (OR)	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Walsh	Wicker	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Hall	Oberstar
Ackerman	Harman	Obey
Alexander	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Allen	Hill	Ortiz
Andrews	Hinchee	Owens
Baca	Hinojosa	Pallone
Baird	Hoefel	Pascrell
Baldwin	Holden	Pastor
Ballance	Holt	Payne
Becerra	Honda	Pelosi
Bell	Hooley (OR)	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berry	Inlee	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Boswell	(TX)	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jefferson	Ross
Boyd	John	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Kanjorski	Rush
Capps	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Cardin	Kildee	Sanchez, Linda T.
Cardoza	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta T.
Carson (OK)	Kind	Sanders
Case	Kleczka	Sandlin
Clay	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lampson	Schiff
Conyers	Langevin	Schrock
Cooper	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Crowley	Lee	Sherman
Cummings	Levin	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Smith (MI)
Davis (FL)	Lowe	Smith (NJ)
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)	Smith (TX)
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Snyder
DeFazio	Majette	Solis
DeGette	Maloney	Spratt
Delahunt	Markey	Stark
DeLauro	Marshall	Stenholm
Deutsch	Matheson	Strickland
Dicks	Matsui	Stupak
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Dooley (CA)	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Emanuel	McIntyre	Tierney
Engel	McNulty	Towns
Eshoo	Meehan	Turner (TX)
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Menendez	Van Hollen
Filner	Michaud	Velazquez
Ford	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Waters
Frost	Mollohan	Watson
Gonzalez	Moore	Watt
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Green (TX)	Murtha	Weiner
Grijalva	Nadler	Wexler
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Woolsey
	Neal (MA)	Wu
		Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Berman	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Carson (IN)	Millender-McDonald	
Cubin	Nethercutt	
Gephardt		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCREST) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1439

Ms. SOLIS and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, the remainder of votes in this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DULUTH BULLDOGS FOR WINNING THE NCAA 2003 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 171.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 171, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]  
YEAS—423

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

Hall	McCarthy (MO)	Rush
Harman	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Harris	McCollum	Ryan (WI)
Hart	McCotter	Ryan (KS)
Hastings (FL)	McCrary	Sabo
Hastings (WA)	McDermott	Sanchez, Linda T.
Hayes	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta T.
Hayworth	McHugh	Sanders
Hefley	McInnis	Sandlin
Hensarling	McIntyre	Saxton
Hergert	McKeon	Schakowsky
Hill	McNulty	Schiff
Hinchee	Meehan	Schrock
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Scott (GA)
Hobson	Meeks (NY)	Scott (VA)
Hoefel	Menendez	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	Mica	Serrano
Holden	Michaud	Sessions
Holt	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Honda	Miller (MI)	Shaw
Hooley (OR)	Miller (NC)	Shays
Hostettler	Miller, Gary	Sherman
Houghton	Miller, George	Sherwood
Hoyer	Mollohan	Shimkus
Hulshof	Moore	Shuster
Hunter	Moran (KS)	Simmons
Hyde	Moran (VA)	Simpson
Inlee	Murphy	Skelton
Isakson	Murtha	Slaughter
Israel	Musgrave	Smith (MI)
Issa	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Istook	Nadler	Smith (TX)
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Snyder
Jackson-Lee	Neal (MA)	Solis
(TX)	Neugebauer	Souder
Janklow	Ney	Spratt
Jefferson	Northup	Stark
Jenkins	Norwood	Stearns
John	Nunes	Stenholm
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Strickland
Johnson (IL)	Oberstar	Stupak
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Sullivan
Johnson, Sam	Olver	Sweeney
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Tancredo
Jones (OH)	Osborne	Tanner
Kanjorski	Ose	Tauscher
Kaptur	Otter	Tauzin
Keller	Owens	Taylor (MS)
Kelly	Oxley	Terry
Kennedy (MN)	Pallone	Thomas
Kennedy (RI)	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Pastor	Thompson (MS)
Kilpatrick	Paul	Thornberry
Kind	Payne	Tiaht
King (IA)	Pearce	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pelosi	Tierney
Kingston	Pence	Toomey
Kirk	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Kleczka	Petri	Turner (OH)
Kline	Pickering	Turner (TX)
Knollenberg	Pitts	Udall (CO)
Kolbe	Platts	Udall (NM)
Kucinich	Pombo	Upton
LaHood	Pomeroy	Van Hollen
Lampson	Porter	Velazquez
Langevin	Portman	Visclosky
Lantos	Price (NC)	Vitter
Larsen (WA)	Pryce (OH)	Walden (OR)
Larson (CT)	Putnam	Walsh
Latham	Quinn	Wamp
LaTourette	Rahall	Waters
Leach	Ramstad	Watson
Lee	Rangel	Watt
Levin	Regula	Waxman
Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Renzi	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Reyes	Weldon (PA)
Linder	Reynolds	Weller
Lipinski	Rodriguez	Wexler
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Lucas (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Wicker
Lucas (OK)	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (NM)
Lynch	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Majette	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
Maloney	Ross	Woolsey
Manzullo	Rothman	Wu
Markey	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
Marshall	Royce	Young (AK)
Matheson	Ruppersberger	Young (FL)
Matsui		

NOT VOTING—11

Berman	Lofgren	Nethercutt
Carson (IN)	Lowey	Peterson (PA)
Cubin	Millender-McDonald	Smith (WA)
Gephardt		Taylor (NC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1446

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 280 had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### ACCOUNTANT, COMPLIANCE, AND ENFORCEMENT STAFFING ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCREST). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 658, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 658, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

YEAS—423

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

Gilcrest	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Gillmor	Lucas (KY)	Ross
Gingrey	Lucas (OK)	Rothman
Gonzalez	Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Goode	Majette	Royce
Goodlatte	Maloney	Ruppersberger
Gordon	Manzullo	Rush
Goss	Markey	Ryan (OH)
Granger	Marshall	Ryan (WI)
Graves	Matheson	Ryun (KS)
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sabo
Green (WI)	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez, Linda
Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Grijalva	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta
Gutiérrez	McCotter	Sanders
Gutknecht	McCrery	Sandlin
Hall	McDermott	Saxton
Harman	McGovern	Schakowsky
Harris	McHugh	Schiff
Hart	McInnis	Schrock
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Scott (VA)
Hayes	McNulty	Sensenbrenner
Hayworth	Meehan	Serrano
Hefley	Meek (FL)	Sessions
Hensarling	Meeks (NY)	Shadegg
Herger	Menendez	Shaw
Hill	Mica	Shays
Hinchey	Michaud	Sherman
Hinojosa	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hobson	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Hoeffel	Miller (NC)	Shuster
Hoekstra	Miller, Gary	Simmons
Holden	Miller, George	Simpson
Holt	Mollohan	Skelton
Honda	Moore	Slaughter
Hooley (OR)	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)
Hostettler	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Houghton	Murphy	Smith (TX)
Hoyer	Murtha	Snyder
Hulshof	Musgrave	Solis
Hunter	Myrick	Souder
Hyde	Nadler	Spratt
Inslee	Napolitano	Stark
Isakson	Neal (MA)	Stearns
Israel	Neugebauer	Stenholm
Issa	Ney	Strickland
Istook	Northup	Stupak
Jackson (IL)	Norwood	Sullivan
Jackson-Lee	Nunes	Sweeney
(TX)	Nussle	Tancredo
Janklow	Oberstar	Tanner
Jefferson	Obey	Tauscher
Jenkins	Olver	Tauzin
John	Ortiz	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (CT)	Osborne	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (IL)	Ose	Terry
Johnson, E. B.	Otter	Thomas
Johnson, Sam	Owens	Thompson (CA)
Jones (NC)	Oxley	Thompson (MS)
Jones (OH)	Pallone	Thornberry
Kanjorski	Pascrell	Tiahrt
Kaptur	Pastor	Tiberi
Keller	Paul	Tierney
Kelly	Payne	Toomey
Kennedy (MN)	Pearce	Towns
Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi	Turner (OH)
Kildee	Pence	Turner (TX)
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
Kind	Peterson (PA)	Udall (NM)
King (IA)	Petri	Upton
King (NY)	Pickering	Van Hollen
Kingston	Pitts	Velazquez
Kirk	Platts	Visclosky
Kleczka	Pombo	Vitter
Kline	Pomeroy	Walden (OR)
Knollenberg	Porter	Wamp
Kolbe	Portman	Waters
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Watson
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Watt
Lampson	Putnam	Waxman
Langevin	Quinn	Weiner
Lantos	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Larson (CT)	Ramstad	Weller
Latham	Rangel	Wexler
LaTourette	Regula	Whitfield
Leach	Rehberg	Wicker
Lee	Renzi	Wilson (NM)
Levin	Reyes	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (CA)	Reynolds	Wolf
Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)	Wu
Linder	Rogers (KY)	Wynn
Lipinski	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Ballenger	Gephardt	Smith (WA)
Berman	Lofgren	Walsh
Carson (IN)	Millender-	
Cubin	McDonald	
Flake	Nethercutt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1454

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN CLASSIFIED DOCUMENTS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on Thursday, June 12, 2003, pursuant to its Rules of Procedure, by majority vote, authorized access to any Member of the House who wishes to review certain documents provided to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by the Director of Central Intelligence in response to the letter from the chairman and ranking member to the director dated May 22, 2003.

Specifically, the documents at issue relate to the available intelligence concerning Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program and Iraq's ties to terrorist groups prior to the commencement of hostilities in Iraq.

These documents are available for review by Members only at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in Room H-405 of the Capitol. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material.

Members wishing to review these documents must contact the committee's Director of Security, Mr. Bill McFarland, in advance to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of committee staff to assist Members in their review of these classified materials and manage the flow of activity in an orderly way.

It should be understood by Members that none of the classified material reviewed by Members is authorized to be disclosed publicly.

It is important that Members also keep in mind the requirements of House rule XXIII, clause 13. That rule permits only those Members of the House who have signed the oath set out in clause 13 of House rule XXIII to have access to classified information.

I would advise Members wishing to review these documents that they should bring with them a copy of the

rule XXIII oath executed by them when they come to the committee office to review that material. If a Member has not yet signed the rule XXIII oath, but wishes to review the documentation provided by the DCI, the committee staff can administer the oath and see to it that the executed form is sent to the Clerk's office.

Additionally, the committee's rules require that before Members are given access to any classified material in the committee's possession, that Members must execute a nondisclosure agreement indicating that they have been granted access to particularly described classified material; they are familiar with both the rules of the House and the committee rules with respect to the classified nature of information contained in the documents they are given for review; and they understand fully the limitations placed on them with respect to disclosure of that information.

The committee requires that this nondisclosure agreement be signed by any Member seeking to review the documents each time the Member seeks to gain access to the documents.

Those are the conditions with which the committee agreed to make this material available to any Member. If there are any questions, please call the committee and we will be glad to elaborate.

---

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX AND SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence ordered the bill, H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, reported favorably to the House with an amendment. The committee's report will be filed later today, Tuesday, June 17, under the unanimous consent just agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to announce that the Classified Schedule of Authorizations and the Classified Annex that accompanies H.R. 2417 will be available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in Room H-405 of the Capitol beginning any time after the bill is filed. The committee office will open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration by the House. I anticipate that H.R. 2417 will be considered on the floor of the House next week.

I would recommend that Members wishing to review the Classified Annex contact the committee's Director of Security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of committee staff to assist Members who desire that assist-

ance during their review of these classified materials.

I urge Members to take some time to review these classified documents before the bill is brought to the floor, in order to better understand the recommendations of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Much of this material cannot be discussed on the floor.

The Classified Annex to the committee's report contains the committee's recommendations on the intelligence budget for fiscal year 2004 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly.

□ 1500

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of rule XXIII, clause 13 of the House. That rule only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath set out in clause 13 of House rule XXIII.

I would advise Members wishing to review the classified annex and its classified schedule of authorizations that they must bring with them a copy of the rule XXIII oath signed by them when they come to the committee office to review that material.

If a Member has not yet signed that oath, but wishes to review the classified annex and schedule of authorizations, the committee staff can administer the oath as a service for that Member and see to it that the executed form is sent to the Clerk's office. We would be happy to do that. Additionally, the committee's rules require that Members execute a nondisclosure agreement indicating that they have been granted access to the classified annex and classified schedule of authorizations, and that they are familiar with both the rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of information contained in the classified annex and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

I am sorry for all the bureaucratism, but we take very seriously our responsibility to keep this matter properly provided for and safeguarded.

---

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 342, KEEPING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SAFE ACT OF 2003

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 276, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 342) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to make improvements to and reauthorize programs under that Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Pursuant to rule XXII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 12, 2003 at page H5307.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are here today to discuss the conference agreement to S. 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003, which reauthorizes and improves the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, CAPTA; the adoption opportunities program; the Abandoned Infants Act; and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act.

We began this process of reauthorizing CAPTA and FVPSA in the last Congress. The conference report before us today shows our ongoing bipartisan effort and our commitment to ensuring that programs aimed at the prevention of child abuse and neglect and family violence continue.

The conference report before us continues to emphasize the prevention of child abuse and neglect before it occurs. It promotes partnerships between child protective services and private and community-based organizations, including education and health systems, to ensure that services and linkages are more effectively provided. It retains important language from the House bill to appropriately address a growing concern over parents being falsely accused of child abuse and neglect and the aggressiveness of social workers in their child abuse investigations.

It retains language to increase public education opportunities that strengthen the public's understanding of the child protection system while teaching the appropriate manner for reporting suspected incidents of child maltreatment. It also retains language to foster cooperation between parents and child protective service workers by requiring caseworkers to inform parents of the allegations made against them, and improves the training opportunities for child protective services personnel regarding the extent and limits of their legal authority in order to protect the legal rights of parents and legal guardians. These are important additions to our Nation's child abuse laws that should not be overlooked.

This conference report retains the House language requiring States to implement policies and procedures to address the needs of infants born and identified as being affected by illegal substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal drug exposure, including the requirement that health care providers involved in the delivery or care of these infants notify child protective services of the occurrence of such condition and develop a plan of safe care for such infants.

In addition, this conference report maintains language expanding adoption opportunities and services for infants and young children who are disabled or born with life-threatening conditions, requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the annual number of infants and young children abandoned each year, and extends the authorization for the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the conferees, both the House and the Senate, for their hard work and efforts in finalizing this conference report. I especially want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for his continued support throughout this process and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for his diligence in ensuring that infants born addicted to drugs receive necessary services. I appreciate the assistance of the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), in ensuring that we have reached this point here today. I, of course, also want to thank the chairman of the Senate HELP Committee, Senator GREGG; the ranking member, Senator KENNEDY; and Senator DODD for their efforts in finalizing this bill.

Most importantly, I also want to thank the staff. This conference report would not be before us today if it were not for the diligence and dedication of the staff who have spent many hours working through the differences in the two bills to ensure that we reached this final agreement.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am very pleased with this conference report. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bicameral, bipartisan effort to improve the prevention and treatment of child abuse and family violence.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today in support of Senate bill 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

First of all, I want to commend Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member MILLER for their movement of this legislation to the floor. Obviously I am pleased with my participation as a member of the conference committee. I also commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for their participation. Also I would like to thank the House committee Democratic staff, Ruth Friedman, Ricardo Martinez, and Maggie McDow and the Republican committee staff, Pam Davidson, Krisann Pearce, Kate Houston, Rebecca Hunt, and Judy Boyer for all of their hard work and collaboration with the Senate staff in shaping this legislation

to better serve some of our neediest and most helpless citizens.

In the year 2000, about 879,000 children were victims of abuse and neglect in this country. Of this number, approximately 1,200 children died of abuse or neglect, and 44 percent of those children were under the age of 1. It is indeed a disturbing thought that an adult would want to hurt an innocent, helpless child. Yet it occurs and it occurs daily in this country. The United States Congress has in the recent past taken to the floor to bring awareness to the problem and the need to deal with child abuse in this country. This resolution allows us to not only acknowledge this tragic problem but also to provide some assistance to the children and the families that are victims of abuse.

I am very proud of the many good provisions of this legislation. One is the increase of funds from \$33 million to \$80 million for community-based groups that run programs to strengthen and support families in efforts to reduce the level of child abuse that exists and that exists among families. There are also other new funds and emphasis to better meet the needs of abused children, such as providing funds to meet the needs of children who witness domestic violence and have policies in place to address the needs of infants who are born and identified as having been physically affected by prenatal exposure to illegal drugs or to HIV or who are HIV-infected.

However, this bill would only be doing half its job if we did not also look at individuals who assist the victims of abuse. There will be grants made available to improve child protection services, particularly cross-training to enable child protection service workers to better recognize the signs of domestic violence and substance abuse in addition to child abuse. It also calls on States to provide better training and to strengthen efforts toward child abuse prevention programs.

As our economy worsens and the number of unemployed, especially long-term unemployment, rises, we need to recall the correlation between the state of the economy and violence. With high unemployment and a weak economy, more adults will become frustrated and depressed, both of which often lead to child abuse. You mix together an unemployed individual who feels depressed, frustrated and stressed, who becomes overwhelmed, and it is unfortunate that more of them will take out their rage or their emotion on whoever is closest or whatever is closest to them. At times, sadly, this may be released on a spouse or a child.

Just as the bill would be incomplete if it did not acknowledge improvements for child protection systems, we would be incomplete in our focus on improving the status of at-risk children if we did not acknowledge the state of the economy and the need of a tax credit for our neediest families. One may not see the correlation, but it

is there. If we are going to stand here today and send the message that we sincerely care about the well-being of the less fortunate victims in our Nation, we cannot then in the next breath send the message to the once-abused mother or father that they are not worth the child tax credit, or to the children who witness domestic violence or violent crimes around their home on a regular and ongoing basis that they are not worth a concrete, comprehensive program like Head Start.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I am proud of this bill, Keeping Families and Children Safe Act; but I also do not believe that we are doing a complete job, that we are doing enough to help the neediest and the most helpless, and sometimes youngest, victims in our Nation to be safe and secure.

And so I commend the gentleman from Michigan; I commend all of those who have worked and helped shape this legislation. I support this legislation.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the conference report on S. 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003. As a member of the conference committee, I am proud that it reauthorizes several programs that are critical to families in our country.

The bill focuses resources on preventing child abuse, improving opportunities for adoption of foster children, and protecting families from violence. It does so by providing necessary funds to identify and address issues of child abuse and neglect and working to stop family violence before it occurs. These issues know no party or boundary.

This bipartisan legislation recognizes that we must address the problems in a comprehensive way. It shows that we can bring public and private resources to bear in this fight by promoting partnerships between child protective services and community-based organizations. The conference report also gives priority to the training, recruitment, and retention of those who provide services for the victims of violence and abuse. We must not lose the benefits of the experience of these individuals.

Our families and children form the basis of our society and the future of our country. By providing a national clearinghouse of effective child abuse prevention programs and training resources for law enforcement and social service personnel, we can help State and local programs operate more effectively. This bill demonstrates our national commitment to the welfare of those most vulnerable of our citizens. We have an opportunity to help break the cycle of domestic violence and abuse and give a better future to children who would have had no future at all. I would urge all of my colleagues to vote for the conference report and pass this legislation today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who is indeed an advocate for children, not only an advocate for children but who is indeed an advocate for whatever is good and wholesome for the United States of America.

□ 1515

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time.

I have very much appreciated his leadership on the issues dealing with children in America. We have spent some time in Texas listening to many of our social worker, skilled social workers from around the Nation giving us instructions on the importance of providing social services to the needs of our children.

To the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the full committee chairman; and to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); and to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for his leadership on this issue, I too rise in support of S. 342, Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003, and will share a number of comments on the importance of this legislation that deals with enhancing the resources and the instructions and guidelines for protecting the Nation's children against abuse and neglect.

It is not my purpose to fault one State over another. Certainly all of us come from jurisdictions that can stand improvement, and this legislation will help us do so. But in the last few weeks and months, we note the tragedies that occurred in the State of New Jersey and Florida, in particular in Florida the missing little girl still yet to be found who was taken away from her grandmother by someone who alleged to be within the children's protective services, and similar stories in the State of New Jersey shows that our system is broken and needs to be fixed. Frankly, this legislation ensures that hopefully that we can focus on that broken aspect.

There is currently a \$2.5 billion spending gap between what this country spends on child abuse and prevention and what is needed, and as a Nation we cannot rest. We cannot sit idly by with the knowledge that millions of children are not being properly cared for. Child abuse and neglect victims may experience one or more kinds of maltreatment including neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological or other maltreatment. Neglect is the most common form of child maltreatment; and in recent years, close to 63 percent of child abuse victims suffer neglect including medical neglect.

Of the millions of children who reported abuse and neglect, 24 percent suffered physical abuse, 12 percent suffered sexual abuse, 6 percent suffered emotional maltreatment, and 3 percent suffered from medical neglect. Sadly, almost 40 percent of the children are

under the age of six. Unfortunately, in my home State of Texas, 47,400 children were confirmed victims of abuse or neglect. There are over 6 million children in Texas. This legislation will hopefully focus with resources, instruction, and of course aiding and insisting on better services in our States to make sure that we confront this problem head on.

Just a few years ago I joined with the children's protective services in Harris County to tackle the problem of abandoned children, to engage in a billboard campaign along with other outreach campaigns to insist that there are other ways to avoid abandoning a baby and leaving a child unattended and to be able to work with the children's protective services and foster parent care to ensure that our children are never abandoned along a roadside or in a garbage dump. We are still working on that problem, Mr. Speaker; and we have a long way to go.

I would say that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is absolutely correct. While we are protecting our children against abuse, whether it is sexual abuse and neglect, whether it is by way of medical treatment or nutrition, we also need to look at programs that are headed our way to this floor; and certainly this morning in a hearing sponsored by the Congressional Black Caucus it is very clear that the Head Start program is not broken and should not be fixed. Absolutely, legislation that is making its way to this floor should not include a block grant provision that takes moneys away from this vital Head Start program, 38 years old, that provides nurturing and caring attitudes toward our children, a nurturing and supportive atmosphere for our parents, immunization and nutrition, giving some of these children two meals a day that they would have never have gotten. This effort to block grant this program even if it is only in eight States, Mr. Speaker, is misdirected and loses the point of what Head Start has done for 38 years. Clearly, we can work to improve our program; but we should not abolish it, and we have people in Congress today, Head Start professionals and parents, who are advocating do not abolish Head Start; and I hope that our colleagues will listen to them.

I would say also, Mr. Speaker, that we have another job yet undone, and that is to provide a tax credit for low-income children. Yes, this legislation is extremely important. But today, June 17, 2003, America's low-income children still do not have a tax credit. What we can do, Mr. Speaker, is immediately pass the Senate bill and send it to the President's desk and send the Senate bill to our low-income families. In my State of Texas, 2.129 million children are missing the impact of a low-income tax credit because we have stalled this legislation in the House. In addition, 12 million to 19 million children could be helped by the Senate bill along with the children of our military

families, some of whom have their loved ones on the front lines of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this body should be a problem-solver. As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) has said, we have a lot of work that we have accomplished, but much work to be done. Let us not abolish Head Start with this misdirected legislation headed to the floor. Let us pass this legislation enthusiastically to protect our children, but yet let us not leave 19 million children out in the cold without an effective child tax credit for low-income families. Let us pass that legislation as we pass S. 342, and let us work to secure and protect Head Start funding to the Head Start programs and not abolish it by block granting those funds to the State.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time, and I ask my colleagues to enthusiastically support S. 342.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying Conference Report on S. 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003. I join my colleagues and reiterate how important it is to protect our children from abuse and neglect.

Many states are dependent on Federal money to meet the increasing demand for child abuse prevention programs. This legislation is important because it is the only Federal legislation that directly addresses the prevention of child abuse. Currently, there is a \$2.5 billion spending gap between what this country spends on child abuse prevention and what is needed. As a nation we cannot rest, we can not sit idly by with the knowledge that millions of children are not being properly cared for.

Child abuse and neglect victims may experience one or more kinds of maltreatment including neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological or other maltreatment. Neglect is the most common form of child maltreatment and in recent years close to 63 percent of child abuse victims suffered neglect (including medical neglect). Of the millions of children who are reported abused or neglected, 24 percent suffered physical abuse, 12 percent suffered sexual abuse, 6 percent suffered emotional maltreatment and three percent suffered from medical neglect. Sadly, almost 40 percent of the children were under the age of 6.

I am particularly concerned with that 12 percent of cases involving sexual abuse. Child sexual abuse includes actual physical abuse such as touching a child's genital area or molestation, and it also includes sexual assault, self-exposure (flashing), voyeurism, and exposing children to pornography.

Unfortunately, in my home state of Texas 47,400 children are confirmed victims of abuse or neglect. I want to put that number into perspective, Mr. Speaker. There are over six million children in Texas. Over one million Texas children live in poverty. Many of the children and families I am talking about would not have been eligible for the Republican's child tax credit. Studies have shown that poverty is one of the many societal elements that can increase the occurrence of child abuse. I am glad to say that this underlying bill will lead to services for all families, including those whose incomes are low.

It is beyond reprehensible that anyone would treat children in this way. Furthermore,

it would be despicable for this Congress not to do everything possible to help prevent such abuse.

Between 1993 and 1999, the incidence of child abuse and neglect declined on the national level. However, after 1999 the incidence of child abuse rose. We must turn that tide back around. We must not be discouraged by the size of the problem we must seek to work together, in a bipartisan way. Because the matter of protecting our children is not political or partisan it is simply the most important thing that this body can do.

There is more that we can do. In fact, there is more that we must do. The underlying bill is a step in the right direction therefore I support the rule on the Conference Report for S. 342.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), vice chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference agreement to S. 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003. Mr. Speaker, this legislation builds upon changes made during the last reauthorization of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, directing its efforts towards the prevention of child abuse and neglect and family violence in collaboration with child protective services. It would ensure that States have the necessary flexibility and resources for identifying and addressing the issues of child maltreatment and family violence before they occur and works to protect and treat abused and neglected children and victims of family violence.

According to the United States Department of Health and Human Services, in 2001 there were an estimated 903,000 victims of abuse or neglect nationally. Almost three-fifths of all victims suffered from neglect, and the most victimized children were in the zero to three age group. In Clark County, Nevada, while there was an increase in the number of child abuse and neglect reports, up in 2001 to 8,316, in 2000 there was a drop to 7,932. There was a decrease in the substantiated child abuse reports as a percentage of the total reports in 2001, having continually declined from 1997. And with the improvements we have established throughout the intense conference negotiations on the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003, I hope to see a further decline in child abuse and family violence across this country.

It is important that children and families can lead safe and healthy lives. Treatment and preventative measures are essential to stopping this abuse. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce has come to the floor, and again I want to reiterate my commendations to him for the outstanding leadership that he has pro-

vided in bringing this legislation before us and to the floor of the House.

I have always been told that the greatness of a society can be determined by how well it looks after its old, how well it looks after its young, and what it does for those who have difficulty in looking out for themselves. And when we think about abused and neglected children, we are thinking about individuals who have difficulty looking out for themselves.

For the last 10 or more years each Christmas Eve, I and a group of my friends visit what we call halfway houses for neglected and abused children; and to see little children in the basements of apartment buildings, in the basements of churches or in many instances just places that the keepers of these facilities have found and to see them there with little hope, with no real encouragement, and not even knowing what the season is about, and to see the glee and the joy that they have just when they are given an apple or an orange or some fruit or a toy that someone else may have just given away, that speaks to what this legislation will mean. If we can prevent families from taking out their frustration on children, if we can find children who have left home, who themselves are confused, if we can bring hope to the hopeless and help to those who are helpless, then that is really what America should be about; and that is one of the things that this legislation helps to do. So once again, I commend all of those who have been instrumental in bringing it to this point.

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

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

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for the kind words and the tone of discussion and the debate today. It is not a debate. We have worked very positively in a bipartisan way to bring this legislation not only through the House but through a conference committee, and one of the instrumental leaders in making sure that that is a tone that we have on the committee and the tone for this piece of legislation is the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and express our appreciation and thanks for having the opportunity to move this bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

I thank both him and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and many others for their efforts in bringing us here, and I rise today in support of the conference report to S. 342, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003. This conference report reauthorizes the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act and related programs and acts. The conference report represents, I think, our efforts and commitment to once again ensure that

programs aimed at the prevention of child abuse and neglect are strengthened and continue to serve vulnerable children.

When this process began, we wanted to ensure that the final bill reflected our strong belief that every child in America deserves the security of being part of a safe, permanent, and caring family. And I am pleased to say that the conference report that we have before us does just that. It aims to improve program implementation, making enhancements to current law to ensure that States have the necessary resources and flexibility to properly address the prevention of child abuse and neglect. This conference report retains language to ensure that children are protected from abuse and neglect through best practice prevention and treatment services. And, importantly, it continues to reflect our belief that we can help achieve this goal by maintaining resources for adoption opportunities, identifying and addressing the needs of abandoned infants, and ensuring that resources continue to be available to promote family violence prevention activities. This conference report also retains language to address the problem of child abandonment and abuse with effective solutions that make a real difference in the lives of children.

In addition, this conference report continues to appropriately address issues regarding child protective services across the United States by enhancing training for personnel, requiring more effective partnerships between child protective services and private and community-based organizations, and improving public education on the children protection system. This conference report enjoys a strong bipartisan support and is widely supported throughout the child abuse prevention and family violence prevention communities. I want to thank all the conferees from both the House and the Senate for their efforts in getting us to this point.

I especially want to thank the Select Education Subcommittee chairman (Chairman HOEKSTRA) for his leadership and dedication to the completion of this conference report; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS); and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my friend and the ranking member of our committee.

□ 1530

I wish to thank Senator GREGG, the Chairman of the Senate Health Committee, Senator KENNEDY, the ranking member, and Senator DODD for their assistance in finalizing and helping us bring this legislation forward today.

I also want to thank the staff for their hard work and their dedication, especially Krisann Pearce, Pam Davidson, Kate Houston, Holli Traud, Alexa Marrero, and Jo-Marie St. Martin of

my committee staff; Ruth Friedman with the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), Ricardo Martinez with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), Rebecca Hunt with the staff of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), Judy Borger and Matt Haggerty with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), and the counsel from the minority side, Mort Zuckerman, whom I see in the Chamber. They have all worked in an especially close way to help bring us here today.

So I want to urge my colleagues to support the conference report to S. 342, and thank them for all of their hard work.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to note it is a pleasure to see as many children in the Chamber as there are to see this bipartisan legislation being approved. I would reiterate that there is nothing more important that America could do than to demonstrate how important children are and prepare for the future leaders of our Nation to emerge, to have the kind of services that they need, the kind of programs.

We cannot afford to lose a single one. So every time we can go out and bring in a child who may have been lost, may have been neglected or may have been abused we are actually doing the best work that we could do. I would urge support of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just reiterate my support to the comments of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). It is absolutely true that society will be measured by how we take care of those who are least able to take care of themselves. This bill is a step in the right direction. I hope that we can continue working on these issues and other issues to make sure that we do not leave a single child behind, either at this stage in life through the education process or later on as they enter into higher education.

Those are all the kinds of issues that we will either consider at the subcommittee or the full committee level, and hopefully we can continue to maintain this bipartisan support on these very, very critical issues, recognizing that we each come from different communities with different perspectives, different backgrounds and different needs, and that by bringing those perspectives to the committee, by bringing those perspectives to the House, we will reach the appropriate kind of legislation that will have the most impact and most beneficial impact across America.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee leadership in both Chambers for bringing forth this agreement, which rep-

resents a bipartisan, bicameral effort to protect children.

As with the Amber Alert legislation, and the Runaway, Homeless and Missing Children Protection Act that passed the House earlier this year, this legislation shows that we are unified in our desire to protect young people who are in danger. I am proud to be a part of this effort.

I won't repeat all the technical aspects of the bill, but this effort will focus on the prevention and treatment of child abuse by authorizing grants to States to help with the functions of the child protection system. It also provides authority for research and demonstration projects, enhances investigations and prosecutions of maltreatment, and provides grants for local community-based programs.

I am pleased that we were able to include in the final agreement demonstration programs to assist children who witness domestic violence as well as an Internet enhancement of the domestic violence hotline.

There is no more important task before this Congress than to protect the most vulnerable of our Nation's children.

I only hope that our commitment to children will extend beyond rhetoric to the resources needed to fully fund these and other programs for children. Unfortunately, help for poor, disadvantaged children has taken a backseat to tax breaks for the wealthy. We are sending a clear message to our young people, not only will we leave you behind, we will also leave you the bill.

I firmly urge all my colleagues to support the final conference agreement. When the time comes, I also urge you to support the resources necessary to protect, defend, and educate our children.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

Conference report to accompany S. 342, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to suspend the rules and adopt S. Con. Res. 43, by the yeas and nays;

Speaker's approval of the Journal, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 342, KEEPING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SAFE ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 342, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 3, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

YEAS—421

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

Greenwood  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffl  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Insole  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Janklow  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
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  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lowe  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall

Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
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  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
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  
Baca  
Velazquez  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Burr  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bell  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Capps  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman

Carson (IN)  
Cubin  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Gephardt  
Lofgren  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Smith (WA)  
Weldon (PA)  
NOT VOTING—10  
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.  
□ 1707  
So the conference report was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.  
SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONGRESS SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 43.  
The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 43, 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 421, nays 1, not voting 12, as follows:  
[Roll No. 283]  
YEAS—421  
Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman

English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
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)  
Greenwood  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffl  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hyde  
Insole  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Janklow  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
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  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lowe  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Kucnich  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lowe  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
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  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
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  
Vitter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
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  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Nethercutt  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)

NAYS—3

Flake Hostettler

Paul

Boozman

Cooper

Engel

Knollenberg

Pryce (OH)

Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)	Wilson (NM)	Wynn
Weller	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Wexler	Wolf	Young (FL)
Whitfield	Woolsey	
Wicker	Wu	

NAYS—1

Nadler

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus	Fattah	Millender-
Carson (IN)	Gephardt	McDonald
Cubin	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart, M.		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes within which to record their vote.

□ 1715

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 283 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 279, I would have voted "no"; Nos. 280, 281, 282, 283, I would have voted "yea." I was detained at the airport unable to get here for hours due to inclement weather and traffic jam and congestion.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PERMISSION FOR PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2417, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have until midnight, June 17, 2003, to file its report on the bill H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I understand the other side of the aisle is in agreement with this request.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DINAN

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, a friend to all my community, Mr. John Dinan, passed away following a courageous fight with cancer, but his unique achievements as a developer will long stand as a testimony to his vision and innovation.

After graduating from the University of Detroit High School in 1944, John went off to serve in the Navy during World War II, and returned to earn a degree in civil engineering.

John began his career in public service, becoming Farmington City Manager, where he garnered experience and recognition by leading the city's successful downtown redevelopment project, despite difficult fiscal conditions. Upon leaving his post, John formed his own development firm, committed to an architectural style, incorporating and complementing the community's natural aesthetics.

During his rise and tenure at the pinnacle of his profession, John always gave back to the neighbors in the communities he developed.

Thus, on behalf of us all, I extend my deepest condolences to his wife Jean, and his entire family, for their loss.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1472

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1472.

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

There was no objection.

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.

TIME TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today is Day Five of the House Republican leadership's campaign to kill the extension of the child tax credit.

The issue is very simple: The Senate has passed the child tax credit, the President says he will sign it, twelve million children in America need it, but the House Republicans want to kill it. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says there is not enough time to meet in conference with the Senate. That reveals his true intent. He does not want this bill to become law.

A conference with the Senate could take just 5 minutes. The House Republicans could simply stop their delaying tactics and accept the Senate bill in the House-Senate conference. The con-

ference report would be quickly approved by each House and sent to the President, who, as I mentioned, has said he will sign it.

But let us be clear, the House Republicans do not want this bill to become law. In the 12 days since the Senate passed its bill by a 94 to 2 vote on June 5, a strong bipartisan vote, 94 to 2, the Republican majority in the House has voted six times not to accept the Senate bill. Instead, the Republicans voted to send a bloated \$82 billion bill to conference, which they know the Senate will not accept. It is not paid for, it is reckless, it is irresponsible.

The Republican leadership in the House simply does not want to expand the child tax credit, which corrects the unfair omission of nearly 12 million children, including 250,000 children of our active duty military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because our constituents have entrusted us with serious responsibilities. We have the responsibility to our veterans and our military to make sure we honor their sacrifices and be true to the resolutions that we make honoring them here in this House almost on a daily basis. That is appropriate, to honor them, to respect their patriotism, their courage, and to recognize the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country. How then can we say to them that their children are not worthy of this extension of the tax credit?

We also have a responsibility to our parents and grandparents to improve and strengthen the Medicare program they know and trust, and we have a responsibility to future generations to leave them with a country that is even better and stronger and more secure than the one we inherited from our parents.

Providing the tax credit to working and military families is not something that we do not have time for. If children are a priority for us, then we make them a priority, and that means we have time for them. It is not something that we can cavalierly shrug off with phrases like "It ain't gonna happen," to quote my colleagues. It is not something that "we should only consider if we get something for it," to quote my colleagues.

This is a central question of fairness and of responsibility to the children and 6.5 million families who are waiting, still waiting, for us to fulfill a promise we made to them.

□ 1730

We are saying to those children, wait until next year, or the check is not in the mail. Whatever it is, it is bad news if you are a family working full-time, but do not make over \$26,000 a year; and it is bad news for our children of the military.

These working and military families pay taxes, just like everyone else, and are struggling to make ends meet in today's stagnant economy. On behalf of the families of 12 million children now waiting for this tax relief, we must correct this callous omission as quickly as possible.

The Senate tax credit bill is fiscally responsible, it is paid for, and it costs \$10 billion compared to the \$82 billion in the House bill. The Senate bill is supported by Democrats and rank-and-file Republicans in the House, and it would immediately provide the tax credit to millions of working and military families let out of the final tax cut bill approved last month. We can pass the bipartisan legislation and send it to the President today.

It is interesting that after the vote on the tax credit last week, where the Republicans' reckless and callous policy prevailed, that on the motion to instruct which followed, 12 Republicans joined the Democrats in a motion to instruct the conferees to take up the Senate bill. We did that because we know we can invest in our children or we can indebt them. That is the choice that the Republicans have put before us.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said, "Children are our greatest resource and our best hope for the future." I urge my Republican colleagues to do the right thing and accept the Senate bill and, in doing so, support the value we place on our children. We cannot say that some children are our greatest resource and our best hope for the future, but not if your parents make the minimum wage or if they are risking their lives on active duty in the military. We recognize our children as our messengers to a future many of us, most of us, will never see. We want them to take forward a message of respect for children, all children in our country. We want to show them that they really are our greatest resource and our best hope for the future.

There is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for the Republican majority not to go immediately to conference and send this bill back to the House for approval and to the President's desk before the end of the month so that every child in America can take advantage of the tax credit whose parents qualify.

#### THE STRAIGHT STORY ON THE HIGH COST OF PHARMACEUTICALS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, a number of us have been coming to the floor of the House to talk about the high cost of prescription drugs here in the United States. We pay more for prescription drugs than any country on the face of the Earth, and many of our senior citizens and others have been going right across the border into Canada and buying pharmaceutical products for half or one-tenth the cost that they are here in the United States.

Now, the Food and Drug Administration and the pharmaceutical companies are doing everything they can to stop Americans from buying pharma-

ceutical products from Canada by saying that there is a safety issue. The fact of the matter is, we checked, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and myself and others; and we have found no cases, none, where Canadian pharmaceutical products that were made here in the United States and reimported back into this country have caused anybody any harm. Absolutely zero.

Now, in my congressional district, the PhRMA companies have been mailing literature to senior citizens saying that there is a safety issue if you buy pharmaceutical products from Canada because they may be contaminated or counterfeit or something else. We have found no cases like that. But they are mailing them into my district trying to scare people trying to influence them to influence me to change my position. Americans should pay no more for pharmaceutical products than they do in other parts of the world; and yet we pay more, by far, than any country: France, Germany, Spain, Canada, anyplace.

Now, today I was watching television and there is a man I respect a great deal, Neal Cavuto; he has a great television show, and he is a very fair newsman. He had a gentleman on his program that said that there was a real problem with safety of these pharmaceutical products coming in from Canada, and the gentleman who was on was so vociferous and so adamant about this that I feel that he must have been paid by the pharmaceutical companies; and if he is not, he should be. Because he is trying to scare Americans into believing they should not buy these pharmaceutical products from Canada.

We have over a million people a year that buy their products from there because they cost so much less, and the attempt is being made to stop that by the Food and Drug Administration saying they are not safe when there is no evidence of that, and by the pharmaceutical companies who are saying they are following the edicts of the Food and Drug Administration.

Now, we are coming up with a prescription drug benefit before too long, and unless we get a handle on these prices and make sure that the American people are paying prices similar to the rest of the world, the taxpayer is going to be picking up the difference between what they pay in Canada and what they pay here in the United States. The senior citizens want the prescription drug benefit, and we want to give it to them; but we do not want the taxpayers of this country saddled with extremely high prices for the products they can buy right across the border for less money.

So it is extremely important, in my opinion, that we get this message out to the American people. And the pharmaceutical companies have \$150 million they are dumping into an ad campaign to try to convince people that these products are not safe when that is just not the case.

So I would just like to say if Mr. Cavuto happens to be watching tonight or any other television commentator, please be fair. Be sure to have the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) or myself or somebody else who has been studying this issue for some time on the program as well to rebut those who are paid for by the pharmaceutical companies to make sure the American people are getting the story straight; not biased, but straight.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### A HATE-HATE RELATIONSHIP WITH MEDICARE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have just never really liked Medicare. Medicare was enacted in 1965, despite the overwhelming opposition of Republicans in Congress. Only 13, fewer than 10 percent, only 13 of the 140 Republicans in the House in those days backed Medicare. Bob Dole voted "no." Gerald Ford voted "no." The soon-to-be minority leader, John Rhodes, voted "no"; Strom Thurmond voted "no," Donald Rumsfeld, a Member of Congress then, all leaders in their party, in the Republican Party, voted against the creation of Medicare. They were unapologetic at the time. Most of them are unapologetic about their opposition and their willingness to undercut Medicare today.

Senator Bob Dole, 20 years later as a candidate for President representing the Republican Party, told a conservative group called the American Conservative Union, he said, "I was there, fighting the fight, one of only 12 voting against Medicare." Actually, I do not know where he came up with 12, there were many more than that, but one of a few, he said, voting against Medicare. The Reagan administration some years later led the first substantive swings at Medicare. With the help of congressional allies, he succeeded in cutting Medicare payments to doctors and raising seniors' Medicare out-of-pocket expenses. But it was not until Republicans took over the House in 1994 the Republican leadership had a realistic chance at obtaining their long-held goal of killing Medicare. House Speaker Newt Gingrich, almost immediately after being sworn in in January, led a failed bid to cut Medicare by \$270 billion to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in the country. Sound familiar? Cut Medicare, free up the dollars, so you can give a tax cut to the richest 5 percent, richest 6 percent of people in this country.

Among the Gingrich Medicare plans, a key supporter was then Governor of

Texas, George W. Bush. That same year, Gingrich offered a candid overview of the Republicans' Medicare strategy and said this: "Now, we didn't get rid of it in round one because we just don't think that is politically smart. We don't think that is the right way to go through a transition. But because of what we are doing," he said, "we believe it is going to wither on the vine."

The privatization extremists' next gambit was launched toward the end of the Gingrich era, hidden within the innocent-sounding Medicare+Choice program. The Medicare privatizers told us that HMOs were so efficient compared to government-run Medicare they could provide both basic and enhanced benefits like prescription drugs for less than traditional Medicare spent on basic benefits alone. HMOs initially received a windfall on the taxpayers' dime, because they only wanted to insure the healthiest people, that did not cost much; and that is how they selectively enrolled those healthiest seniors. When that windfall was erased by providing the cost of extra benefits, HMOs came back to Congress asking for more money and abandoned their original efficiency rhetoric and brazenly charged that Medicare had "shortchanged" them.

Did we cut our losses? Did Congress cut our losses and end the Medicare+Choice program? No. For the Medicare privatization crowd in Congress, a private failure was still better than a public success, so Congress again diverted scarce taxpayer dollars from the traditional Medicare program, taking money from the 85 percent of the people who are in traditional fee-for-service, old-time, regular, it-works Medicare and shored up the failed insurance scheme HMO+Choice system.

Now, with the same George W. Bush in the White House who championed the Gingrich Medicare cuts in the mid-1990s to pay for tax cuts for the rich when he was Governor, the time is right, President Bush seems to think, for Republicans to now launch a full-scale attack to privatize Medicare. The Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means are considering radical bills this week, voucher bills, Medicare privatization bills that will end Medicare as we know it, end the Medicare that has been with us for almost 40 years, almost 4 decades, and will end it by the year 2010.

The fact of the matter is the Republican bill will replace Medicare's dependable, affordable and universal coverage with a voucher program. Millions of seniors, already burned by Medicare+Choice abandonments, so many seniors have seen their Medicare HMOs go out of business, leave the State, leave the counties as they have in Lorain and Summit and Medina counties in my district, those same seniors are going to be asked to one more time put their faith in Medicare+Choice, in Medicare HMOs.

Benefits and premiums would vary from county to county, ending the equity embodied by Medicare for a generation, and the Republican bill would cover only a small fraction of the Medicare costs.

The only question is whether the majority of Americans who recognize a success when they see one will let Republicans get away with putting the final stake in Medicare's heart.

#### AMERICANS PAY TOO MUCH FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS UNDER UNFAIR SYSTEM

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke, he and I strongly disagree. I happen to believe that it is time to modernize Medicare, it is time to give seniors more choices, and we will come to different conclusions on that particular issue. But there is an issue that we do agree on, and that is that Americans pay far too much for the same pharmaceuticals.

Last week, on Thursday, I was privileged to welcome to the Capitol and to one of my news conferences a true American hero. Her name is Kate Stahl. Kate Stahl wears a little pin that says "Kate Stahl: Old woman." She is 84 years old and she is proud of the fact; in fact, she describes herself as a drug runner. I would encourage Members to get a copy of the June 9 edition of the U.S. News and World Report, and they will see a picture of Kate Stahl in that edition. And in there it says, and she is quoted as saying, "I hope they put me in jail." Because what she does every day, working with the senior Federation in the State of Minnesota, is she helps seniors get access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. As a result, our own Federal Government treats her as if she is a common criminal. But she is prepared to go to jail to make a point, and that is that Americans should not have to pay the world's highest prices for prescription drugs.

We also welcomed to Washington last Thursday Dr. Wenner from Vermont. She is working with pharmacists in Canada so that her patients from her clinics can save, and these are her numbers, have been saving 62 percent on the same prescription drugs by working with pharmacies in Canada.

Now, the FDA acknowledged at a hearing that we had last week that any of the evidence about safety is only anecdotal. As a matter of fact, by their own numbers, they cannot come up with a single case where an American patient has suffered serious injury as a result of taking a legal prescription drug from a pharmacy from a different country. We also know that more people have become seriously ill and some have actually died from eating imported fruits and vegetables. We know

that, for example, in one year, just a few years ago, over 1,100 Americans became seriously ill by eating raspberries that had been imported from Guatemala.

Now, when we talk about safety, I think the real question is, who are we protecting from whom? Who is really being protected by our FDA? More and more of us are coming to the conclusion that the only people really being protected are the big executives of the large pharmaceutical companies. We ask ourselves, why are Americans, the world's best customers, paying the world's highest prices? And the answer is, because we are a captive market and because our own FDA literally puts a border around our country and will not allow Americans to have access to those drugs.

□ 1745

As I mentioned, we import thousands of tons of food every day from all over the world. Last year, for example, we imported 318,000 tons of plantains. People say, well, somebody might get into these Fed Ex packages and get inside the tamper proof packages and somehow substitute counterfeit drugs, but again, the evidence of that is anecdotal at best, and if we stop and think just for a moment that if terrorists really wanted to get at the broad base of the American consumers, would they really resort to trying to break into UPS offices, Fed Ex offices to get into those packages and somehow tamper with those pharmaceuticals? I think common sense tells us that that simply is not going to happen.

We as Americans should be willing to pay our fair share for all of the costs of the research and development for the miracle drugs that are coming out of the pharmaceutical companies that help save lives. We ought to be willing to pay our fair share, but we have to be willing to say that it is time for us to say, yes, we will subsidize sub-Saharan Africa, but we are going to stop subsidizing the starving Swiss.

I am a Republican. I believe that the word "profit" is actually a good word. There is nothing wrong with the word "profit," but there is something wrong with the word "profiteer," and I am delighted that we have people like Kate Stahl who will stand on the shoulders of the sons of liberty who threw tea in Boston Harbor because they saw something clearly was unfair, and they were not going to take it anymore. She represents literally millions of seniors and consumers here in the U.S. who are saying enough is enough, we are not going to take it anymore.

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

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

## A WEAKER DOLLAR

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on the weakening dollar. A weak dollar that is too weak has certain dangers but a weak dollar sounds worse than it is. The dollar is strong when the dollar purchases more foreign currency than it had previously, but as there are many other currencies, it is quite possible for the dollar to be getting stronger against some currencies and weaker against others.

For example, looking at the Canadian dollar, the Japanese yen and the European euro over the last 2½ years, it is clear that the dollar has weakened against two of these currencies and strengthened against the other. At the beginning of 2001, the U.S. dollar bought 1.05 euros, 1.49 Canadian dollars and 14.75 Japanese yen. On June 11 of this year, the U.S. dollar bought .849 euros, down 19 percent; 1.35 Canadian dollars, down 10.4 percent; and 117.68 Japanese yen, up about 2.5 percent.

I present these facts on the dollar simply to say that in some cases, depending on the other foreign countries, the dollar goes up in value and sometimes it goes down.

The dollar becomes strong when the demand for the dollar increases relative to the supply of dollars, a supply-and-demand situation. There are several ways for this to happen. For example, and it looks like it has happened, if Japan wished to make its exports cheaper, its Central Bank could buy U.S. dollars, strengthening the dollar against the yen, or if the Federal Reserve increases the U.S. money supply, there will be more dollars relative to other currencies, and the value of the dollar is going to decline. Also, the lowering of interest rates by the Feds tends to push down the value of the dollar.

What happens when all of this occurs, because the question is whether a strong dollar is good or bad for the U.S. economy?

In reality, it is that a strong dollar is good for some Americans and bad for others. I think it is important that we learn about what is happening to the value of the dollar because it affects our lives. Suppose that one is an auto maker in Michigan. Their company sells cars in the U.S. and exports to Europe and Japan. Japanese companies and European companies also sell cars to the U.S. and Japan and Europe. If the U.S. dollar weakens against the yen and the euro, then the U.S. cars will be less expensive for Japanese and European consumers, and the Japanese and European cars will be more expensive for U.S. customers. This will result in more profit and higher employment in the U.S. auto industry.

In other words, as the dollar weakens, it is easier to export our products because in relative terms, to other

countries' currencies, those products become less expensive.

On the other hand, if one buys foreign made products, the weaker dollar means that they have to pay more or suppose that they work for a company that uses German and Japanese steel to produce, let us say, washing machines. A weaker dollar will make foreign steel more costly, thus making their company's product more expensive, and this is going to result in fewer jobs and probably less employment.

In the last 2 years, we have seen an increase in the U.S. money supply, a lowering of U.S. interest rates in a U.S. economy that is now outperforming the European Canadian Japanese economies. However, inflation is a risk with an increasing money supply, and foreign investors have less interest in leaving their money in U.S. stocks, and all of these things are consistent with a weaker dollar.

So we are not totally on safe ground as it becomes easier to export.

Economists have long been divided over how much the money supply could be increased which would influence the strength of the U.S. dollar.

In conclusion, in practice, the dollar is likely to gain strength against some currencies and lose strength against others. The effect on the U.S. economy will depend on which countries we are importing from and which countries we are exporting to and a myriad of other factors, including the strength of the foreign economies relative to ours. The current weaker U.S. dollar means that consumers will tend to pay a little more, but it will be good for producers and, therefore, better for job growth than otherwise.

The danger is in concerning our balance of trade. If we are importing so much more than we export, that means other countries will have extra dollars to spend, and they are going to continue to use those dollars to buy our equities.

---

#### INVESTMENT IN OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our transportation system is second to none, but let us not sit on our hands. We still have room to improve.

Thanks to the leadership of President Eisenhower, and thanks to his experience under the vision of General John Pershing, we have the interstate highway system. Just as this Nation made a choice a half century ago, we need to make a choice again today. We need to make a decision. We must decide if we want to continue the legacy of President Eisenhower, General Pershing and other leaders who came before us. We must decide to make a major commitment to fund our Nation's infrastructure needs.

As I have said before, I will say it again tonight, we have study after

study. We have pages and pages of numbers. We have the proof. The issue is no different now than it was 50 years ago under President Eisenhower. Our transportation needs continue to grow, and we need to find a way to adequately fund those needs.

The needs are many, but the answer is simple. We need to invest more in our transportation system. Here, however, in today's economy, the problems and needs are not only just with our transportation system.

In today's economy, where corporate profits inch up, we still have a 6 percent unemployment rate. The other numbers are even grimmer: 9 million unemployed Americans; 5 million underemployed Americans; and 2 million Americans have been out of a job for 6 months; 4.4 million Americans have just completely given up even looking for a job, and they have left the workforce altogether.

In today's economy, we simply have to think about more than just TRB studies, government lingo, conditions and performance reports and bureaucratic infighting, things that probably do not matter a great deal to many Americans. What we must do is to start thinking about the sluggish economy. We have to start thinking about and talking about how the loss of jobs and the 6 percent unemployment rate creates real problems and real economic hardships in the lives of millions of Americans, American workers who just are not working because they cannot find good jobs. There are not good jobs out there.

Even better yet, let us start doing something about it because we are in a position to do just that. The concept of the expansionary fiscal policy is nothing new. It has worked before and it will work again. It is the basic economics of pump-priming the economy.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, each \$1 billion invested in infrastructure creates 47,500 jobs and 6.1 billion in related economic activity. With a 6 percent overall unemployment rate and an 8.3 unemployment rate for construction workers, there is no better economic stimulus package than the \$375 billion public works bill, plain and simple.

It is a jobs bill that will put jobs back in the American economy and put American workers back to work.

---

#### KILL THE DEATH TAX

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of H.R. 8, the permanent repeal of the estate tax, more honestly described as the death tax.

Mr. Speaker, I believe as most Americans do that it is unacceptable for a grieving family who has recently lost a loved one to get a visit from the undertaker and the IRS agent on the same

day. It is simply unconscionable and it ought to be illegal.

The death tax is really a tax on the American dream. Americans work hard their whole lives, they save, they invest. They build farms and shops and factories, hoping to pass along their dream to their families once they are gone, but after years of paying payroll taxes and income taxes and sales taxes and property taxes, many businesses do not make it, and those that do, the government can step in and take over half of what someone worked their whole life to build.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up working on a farm. I represent a large portion of rural Texas, and rural Texas is a great place to live, but it can on occasion be a challenge to be a good place to earn a living. I know firsthand that farmers and ranchers and small business owners have to work extremely hard to provide for their families.

A while back ago, I heard from a constituent, a rancher in Leon County. He told me how he had worked hard for over 30 years to build a cattle ranch. He almost lost it once or twice through draught and low beef prices, but he persevered, and with his family by his side, he made it into a great success. His greatest dream was to leave this ranch to his son and his daughter who had worked alongside of him, but with sadness in his voice, he told me by the time the government takes its share, there is just not enough to go around.

Many of my colleagues like to talk about tax fairness, but Mr. Speaker, is it fair to take this man's ranch away from him? Is it fair that Americans are being taxed twice on the same income? Is it fair that after a family member is gone that his loved ones are presented with a tax bill? Is it fair that the Federal Government can automatically inherit 55 percent of the family farm, business or nest egg? Aside from the fact that the death tax is inherently unfair, what about its impact on our economy?

Mr. Speaker, while small businesses create two out of every three new jobs in our Nation, death taxes can kill those small businesses and the jobs that they represent. In fact, death taxes are the leading cause of dissolution for small businesses in America.

According to the Center for the Study of Taxation, 70 percent of businesses never make it past the first generation because of death taxes. Eighty-seven percent do not make it beyond the third generation.

How do death taxes kill American jobs? With the death of a small business owner, many employees often lose their jobs when the relatives of the deceased are forced to liquidate the business just to pay the taxes.

□ 1800

One-third of small businesses are sold or liquidated to pay death taxes, and half of those businesses are forced to eliminate 30 or more jobs. Furthermore, small and mid-sized manufactur-

ers spend \$52,000, on average, just for death tax planning. Now, \$52,000, that is a good paycheck that could be going home to somebody back in the fifth district of Texas.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, repealing the death tax can create 200,000 extra jobs a year helping more Americans get back to work, giving them a paycheck instead of an unemployment check, and giving yet another boost to our recovering economy. According to the National Federation of Independent Businesses, nearly 60 percent of business owners say they would add jobs in the near future if the death taxes were eliminated.

And what does our society get for the death tax? Nothing. According to the Joint Economic Committee, the cost of compliance with the death tax to the economy is roughly equivalent to the tax shield. All of those family businesses liquidated, all of those jobs lost, all of those family farms sold and all of those nest eggs cut in half. For what?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard those on the other side of the aisle use the same old tired class warfare rhetoric again and again in dealing with the death tax issue. The politics of envy. But when something is wrong, Mr. Speaker, it is simply wrong; and it does not matter if the death tax only affected one person in America. Taxing anyone twice for the same work, for the same income, for the same savings is unconscionable; and it ought to be illegal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the permanent repeal of the death tax. It is time to end the death tax so we can resurrect the American Dream.

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

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

#### FREE SARAH SAGA

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the Bible tells us that pure religion is this: "To look after widows and orphans in their distress." And I rise tonight, preparing to catch up with my wife and our three small children for dinner, feeling compelled in my heart to stand up on behalf of a young American woman and her two small children who at this very hour are hold up in the U.S. consulate in Jeddah in Saudi Arabia.

I rise to tell the story of Sarah Saga and her two little girls, this American woman, and to demand State Department action. As a member of the Committee on International Relations, I am obviously fascinated to see the House of Saud and the Government of

Saudi Arabia engaging in a public relations campaign here in America. In markets across the country, our television screens are being flooded with a message that Saudi Arabia is a "modern nation"; that America and Saudi Arabia have "shared values."

Prince Bandar Bin Sultan, the Saudi Arabia Ambassador to the United States, is part of a public relations offensive to change the image of the Saudi Government. But I would offer today, as is documented in today's editorial page of the Wall Street Journal, we do not need words, Mr. Speaker; we need actions by the House of Saud.

Sarah Saga's story began long ago. She found herself trapped in Saudi Arabia at the age of 6 when her Saudi father defied a U.S. custody agreement by simply refusing to return her to America after she visited her father in 1985. There she has languished ever since. Yet she never gave up on America or her American mom. This 6-year-old, now grown into a 23-year-old mother of two, used a computer to track her long-lost mother via the Internet and to tell her of her hopes for escape. She has made her way to the U.S. consulate in Jeddah, and there she languishes. Absent aggressive State Department actions and negotiations, there she will languish still.

Sadly, hers is just another story of another American woman who is trapped in Saudi Arabia, told that she is able to leave so long as she leaves her children behind. That is outrageous and utterly unacceptable. Prince Bandar told the Wall Street Journal back in September that it was "absolutely not true" that any American women were held against their will in Saudi Arabia. But the story of Sarah Saga tells otherwise.

So I rise tonight not to speak to the House of Saud, but rather to speak to the State Department of the United States of America and to the Bush administration and to Secretary of State Powell. As we negotiate a road map for peace in the Middle East, let us speak plainly to our allies in Saudi Arabia about the minimal expectations we have about American citizens and their progeny in their midst.

Sarah Saga and her two small children must be permitted to leave Saudi Arabia and make that long, at last, homecoming, delayed 17 years, to be in the home of her birth, the United States of America.

#### DESTRUCTION OF MEDICARE

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. Mr. Speaker, the good news is that seniors are living longer. President Lyndon Baines Johnson, a Texan, signed the 1965 legislation entitled Medicare, which opened the doors of life to seniors of America, the same senior citizens who prior to World War II were

dying at very early ages; the same young men and women of the Greatest Generation who went into World War II and came home with no real hope that they would live their lives past 50. This 1965 legislation gave hope to that generation and many generations thereafter.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, somewhat troubled and certainly frightened by the proposition that this House and the Republican leadership would move to privatize a system that has worked. As we debated this today on the floor of the House, it is well known that the Committee on Ways and Means received 400 pages at 1 o'clock and began to mark up a proposed Medicare prescription drug benefit legislative initiative.

For the years that I have been in Congress, year after year and term after term, I have met with my senior citizens in the 18th Congressional District, throughout that district, and promised them and agreed with them that they deserved a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit from the United States Congress. I am sad to say that we have come now to a time where there may be a vigorous debate on this issue and our seniors will still be left out in the cold.

The doughnut, Mr. Speaker, is growing larger and larger. This emerging gap in the proposal that is now being marked up by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not answer the question of saving the lives of seniors or giving to them that long-held hope to have a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit. In fact, it is a hand out, not a hand up.

If we look at this proposal of the majority of this House, it is a glaring and outstanding and shameful proposal where there is an enormous gap between the monies that these seniors will receive. If they spend up to \$2,000, that is fine, Mr. Speaker. But after \$2,000, they are left holding the bag, spending upwards of \$5,000 on their prescription drug benefits, with no hope and no help. The promises we have made about a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit, I think, have gone up in fumes and fire.

Let me share with you, Mr. Speaker, what our good friends are proposing. Prescription drugs are the stalking hawk for the Republicans' boldest attempt to privatize Medicare yet. The Republican plan converts the Medicare program to a premium support or voucher system where the government only pays a percentage of the cost of the premium. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, we have survived 38 years, 2 more years until the 40th anniversary of Medicare. It is not expected to go insolvent for another 3 or 4 decades, and yet we are beginning to privatize this system where seniors will not have the helping hand that they need.

Hard-working seniors have invested into this economy, paid taxes, Mr. Speaker, and provided the

underpinnings of our economy. Many seniors will have to pay more if they want to stay in the same Medicare they have today. Rising fee-for-service premiums will drive all but the sickest to the private plans, resulting in programs becoming unaffordable for all but the wealthy. It ends our Medicare entitlement, the plan begun under President Johnson in 1965. Under this program, beneficiaries no longer will be entitled to the benefits as they are today.

I emphasize that this privatizing of Medicare does not provide a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit, which we all know is needed in this Nation; with no guarantee of what seniors will get; and the private insurance plans, not seniors' doctors, determining what drugs they can get.

I am very pleased to have heard my bipartisan colleagues on the floor of the House today mention how expensive and devastating it is to pay for prescription drugs. I want to work with my pharmaceuticals. I believe they could work with us on a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit. But in the instance of this private insurance plan, it will be those pharmaceutical benefit officers that will be able to tell you what you can afford and what you cannot, no guarantee of how much seniors will have to pay.

Private insurance plans set their own premiums. The \$35 premium is not a guarantee, just a suggestion. And you know what, it will go up and up and up. In this instance, as the song says, the stairsteps to heaven, it certainly will not be. It will certainly be a downward trend to devastation and higher costs for our seniors, with a wide variance in costs to seniors across the country. Private insurance plans also determine seniors' deductibles and cost-sharing.

Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago I sat in rooms filled with seniors who were crying because they had closed the six HMOs treating seniors in Harris County. No room at the inn. No HMOs to provide for my seniors. Why did they leave? They left, Mr. Speaker, because it was not profitable.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say the Medicare gap in the Republican Medicare prescription drug proposal is outrageous. You are going to burden our senior citizens with this gaping hole of \$3,000 and upwards with that plan.

Medicare is alive and well, 38 years, just 2 more years before its 40th birthday. Let us pass a real Medicare guarantee drug benefit for our seniors and give to them the tribute that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we Democrats have been fighting for years for a Medicare prescription drug program that is (1) affordable; (2) available to all seniors and Medicare beneficiaries with disabilities; (3) offers meaningful benefits; and (4) is available in the Medicare program—the tried and true program that seniors trust.

And now it seems that we have the political momentum to make a good prescription drug benefit a reality. The President says he wants

it. Both parties, both sides of Capitol—every one has declared their commitment to getting affordable prescription drugs to our nation. So why is it that the only Medicare prescription drug "plan" the Republicans have to offer is a terrible bill with full of holes, and gifts to the HMOs, and protections for pharmaceuticals companies. Every time we get a chance to take a closer look at the Republican drug scheme, it becomes more obvious that it is just another piece of the Republican machine that is trying to dismantle Medicare and turn our federal commitment to our nation's seniors, over to HMOs and the private insurance industry.

The Republican plan would be run by HMOs, not Medicare. HMOs would design the new prescription drug plans, decide what to charge, and even decide which drugs seniors would get. Plus, HMOs would only have to promise to stay in the program for one year. That means that seniors might have to change plans, change doctors, change pharmacies, and even change the drugs they take every twelve months. Medicare expert Marilyn Moon told the Senate Finance Committee on Friday that "There will be a lot of confused and angry consumers in line at their local pharmacies in the fall," if the Republican approach is not changed. She's right.

The Republican plan provides poor benefits, and has a giant GAP in coverage. Under the House Republican plan, many seniors would be required to pay high premiums even when they don't receive benefits. Reportedly, under the House GOP plan, Medicare beneficiaries have a high \$250 deductible. After they reach that deductible, they would then be required to pay a portion of their first \$2,000 in drugs costs—that is a fairly normal system. But, after a senior's costs hit \$2000 for a year—that is when it becomes obvious just how bad this plan is. Once a senior's drug costs hit \$2000, the Republican plan cuts them off. Even though they must continue to pay premiums, they get no assistance in paying their drug costs at all until their costs reach \$5,100. Let me say that again. It seems so crazy, it is almost unbelievable. The sickest of our seniors, the ones on the most medications—once their costs reach the \$2000 mark—they fall into the Republican gap. They are left to pay the next \$3000 out of their own pockets, while continuing to pay premiums. Almost half of seniors would be affected by this gap in coverage. They will be outraged, and our offices will be hearing about it.

I have attended hundreds of health care briefings, and have read everything I can get my hands on, on the subject of improving Medicare and getting good health insurance to the American people. And I have never heard anyone say that a hallmark of a smart health insurance program is to have a giant gap in coverage for those who need help the most. Why would our Republican colleagues put in this ditch in the road to health for seniors? Because they wasted all of our nation's hard earned money, on massive tax breaks for the rich, and an unnecessary war.

So now they have placed an arbitrary budget cap on vital programs, pushed by President Bush, in order to compensate for the irresponsible Republican tax cut they jammed through this Congress and last Congress. The way they are dealing with the mess that they have made is by throwing bad policy after bad policy. To remain within their own arbitrary budget cap, they are pitching a bill that will provide

a confusing, insubstantial benefit to the majority of seniors.

If the Republicans wanted to save money, they could have put in a provision that I and many Democrats have pushed for—and that is to allow the Secretary of the HHS to negotiate with the pharmaceutical to get fairer prices for the American people. I believe that the American pharmaceuticals industry is the best in the world. They make good products that benefit the world. But Americans are now paying double the cost for drugs than their counterparts in other rich nations such as Germany, Canada, Great Britain, or Japan. I am glad our companies are making money. But as we enact a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, access to drugs will rise—and drug company profits will rise as well. It is only fair that the Secretary should have the power to negotiate a good price for American consumers, to make sure we get the best returns possible on our federal investment.

Not only did the Republicans not put in a provision to allow such negotiations, they went out of their way to forbid the Secretary from trying to get better prices for Americans. Why, because they value the profits of their corporate sponsors at Pharma, more than they do the well-being of our nation's seniors.

Similarly, the Republican plan's design wastes billions in kickbacks for HMOs—instead of using that money to bring down the premiums and out-of-pocket costs that seniors and the disabled are forced to pay.

The Republican plan is not available to everyone on Medicare. First, the House Republican plan reportedly will introduce “means-testing” for Medicare benefits—by which seniors with higher incomes would have to pay considerably more out-of-pocket before they reached the catastrophic limit. Medicare is supposed to be for all seniors, it is not welfare, just for the poor. It should be protected as such. What's more, under the Senate Republican approach, low-income seniors and Americans with disabilities would receive nothing at all—the 17 percent of medicare beneficiaries who are also eligible for Medicaid are simply left out. This misguided policy endangers coverage for millions of seniors whose fluctuating incomes change their Medicaid eligibility for year to year.

The Republican plan rolls the dice, gambling seniors' health. By relying on insurance companies to offer coverage instead of guaranteeing benefits in Medicare, the Republican approach runs the risk that no company will offer benefits to seniors in rural communities, where millions of Americans have already been abandoned by HMOs in search of bigger profits elsewhere. There are 9.2 million Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas nationwide. Eighty percent of these seniors have no access to any Medicare HMO. Only 13 percent of them have access to a Medicare HMO that offers a drug benefit. The bill we are getting glimpses of takes failed policy, and expands it to critical areas.

The Republican plan is a risky scheme only an HMO could love. The Bush Administration's Medicare Administrator has called traditional Medicare “dumb” and “a disaster,” highlighting Republicans' disdain for a program that Democrats have been fighting for since 1965. While Democrats have worked to modernize Medicare with prescription drugs, preventive care and other new benefits, Republicans are insisting on a riskier course even

the Wall Street Journal calls a business and social “experiment.”

The Republican plan destroys Employer Retiree coverage. The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that about one third of private employers will drop their retiree drug coverage under a proposal like the one being contemplated. In order to lower its costs, the House Republican plan stipulates that any dollar an employer pays for an employee's drug costs would not count towards the employee's \$3,700 out-of-pocket catastrophic cap. This would therefore disadvantage seniors with employer retiree coverage because it would be almost impossible for them to ever reach the \$3,700 catastrophic cap, over which Medicare would pay 100 percent of their drug costs. The practical effect of this is that employers will stop offering retiree coverage. That is a step in the wrong direction.

We can do better. The House Democrats' legislation, that I am a proud cosponsor of, is designed to help seniors and people with disabilities, not HMOs and the pharmaceuticals industry. Under the Democratic proposal, the new Medicare prescription drug program would be affordable for seniors and Americans with disabilities and available to all no matter where they lived. It offers a meaningful benefit with a guaranteed low premium; and would be available as a new “Medicare Part D” within the traditional Medicare program that seniors know and trust.

I am committed to getting seniors the prescription medications that their doctors deem they need. I want to work with our Colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and the Administration to make that happen. But unless I see a plan without a gap—with a consistent benefit—with some smart cost-controls—and some protections for Medicare, an excellent program for Americans, I cannot support this Republican drug scheme.

Let's do better.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, DEATH TAX REPEAL PERMANENCY ACT OF 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-157) on the resolution (H. Res. 281) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1528, TAXPAYER PROTECTION AND IRS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-158) on the resolution (H. Res. 282) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1528) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect taxpayers and ensure accountability of the Internal Revenue Service, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING BOB SCHROEDER

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend, Bob Schroeder, who has been named Town of Hooksett's Citizen of the Year. Bob was instrumental in the restoration and revitalization of a truly historic local, State, and national landmark.

Robie's Country Store, in Hooksett, has a lengthy history of acting as the town's gathering spot, a place to argue politics, play checkers, buy groceries and homemade baked goods. Robie's was also a required stop for local politicians and Presidential candidates visiting the first-in-the-Nation primary State for over 30 years.

The store closed in 1997, after the store's owners, Lloyd and Dorothy Robie, retired. After 5 years of dormancy, and a lack of funds and dedicated owners, Robie's Country Store reopened, continuing its 30-year political tradition and its 110-year presence in the town.

Bob Schroeder saw an imperative need to preserve this cultural and political landmark and formed the Robie's Country Store Historic Preservation Association to spearhead the renovation effort. The association has worked diligently to bring the store to life again; and on May 24, 2003, Robie's Country Store reopened to an eager and proud community.

□ 1815

Bob and the Preservation Association were careful to maintain Robie's historical accuracy by keeping the 97-year old building's flooring, ceiling and picture wall of political memorabilia. Always humble, Bob refuses to take credit for the grand reopening of the store, instead pointing the spotlight on the efforts of the entire community. Under Bob's leadership, people of all ages worked together to restore Robie's through fundraising and renovation efforts. The community's hard work will undoubtedly ensure that the rich heritage and traditions of the store will remain intact for future generations to enjoy.

Bob's tireless commitment to preserving this landmark and energizing the whole community to get involved is a wonderful example of his perseverance and dedication to improving the community and State in which he lives. I can think of no better person than Bob Schroeder to receive the Hooksett Citizen of the Year Award, and I am honored to represent him and all other concerned and conscientious citizens from Hooksett and the First Congressional District of New Hampshire.

---

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF LILLINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under a previous

order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of my hometown, Lillington, North Carolina, the seat of Harnett County. For 100 years, Lillington has been home to many enterprising, patriotic and public-spirited citizens. Today as the town prepares to mark this occasion, I want to recognize the history, success and integrity of this remarkable community. When we talk of famous places, we often talk about buildings and landmarks, like the Capitol here in Washington, D.C., or the Empire State Building in New York.

While Lillington does not have any skyscrapers, it does have people of great character. It is that character which has made Lillington one of America's great communities. Named for General Alexander Lillington, a hero of the American Revolutionary War who is known for his heroic efforts at the battle of Moore's Creek Bridge in 1776, Lillington is one of those special places that welcomes with open arms strangers and family alike. Its citizens sincerely care about the well-being of their neighbors, as evidenced by their dedication to numerous civic organizations, schools, and churches in the area.

On July 4 and 5, and throughout this year, Lillington will celebrate its honored past and the centennial of its formal incorporation. The Greater Lillington Centennial Celebration will be marked by numerous events, including the dedication of roadside historic markers honoring General Lillington and Cornelius Harnett, for whom Harnett County is named; a lecture series honoring notable people who have lived and worked in the community; the installation and dedication of a town clock in front of town hall; the publishing of a history of the community entitled *Lillington—A Sketchbook*; and many other celebrations and reunions.

After my discharge from the Army in 1968, I moved to Lillington and immediately discovered what a unique place it is. In Lillington, Faye and I have raised our three children, Bryan, Catherine and David. It is truly a great place to live, work and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, Lillington and other towns like it are the backbone of America. They may be hard to find on a map, but it is easy to understand their importance to this great Nation. It is in these tight-knitted communities that our Nation's values are shaped and future hopes reside. As Lillington moves into its second century, it has a bright future ahead of it, and I know that if we are willing to dream big and work hard, Lillington's next 100 years will be even more prosperous and purposeful than its first. I ask my colleagues to join Faye and me today in celebrating Lillington's 100th anniversary.

#### CONSERVATIVE MYTHS ABOUT THE ESTATE TAX

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I heard two gentlemen this evening, one from Minnesota, the other from Texas, say some things and I need to respond even though it is also part of what I am going to be saying this evening.

One gentleman said the folks on this side of the aisle are concerned about class warfare. Now if we were in session, I would ask his words to be taken down because that has happened one too many times. That is serious business. That is political warfare here. We are all Americans, and we have a right to our opinions.

The other gentleman, the gentleman from Minnesota, talked about unfairness, that we on this side are unfair. Let me tell Members what is unfair. That is the subject about which I speak tonight.

The recent CBO study found that between 1979 and 1997, the after-tax incomes of the top 1 percent of the families rose 157 percent. The wealthiest 5 percent went up 81 percent compared with only a 10 percent gain of the people in the middle of the income distribution.

Mr. Speaker, during that period of time, incomes in the bottom fifth of the population actually fell. That is what is unfair. I want to examine tonight the five myths, I call them lies, that the Republicans have put forth on the estate tax.

The first myth: Many Americans will benefit from the repeal of the estate tax. It is in all of their literature. Well, let me see what the case is. Because the estate tax only falls on estates worth over a million, it only affects the richest of the 1.4 percent of American families. Two-thirds of the estate tax revenues comes from the wealthiest 0.2 percent. When the higher exemptions are fully implemented so a two-parent family could transfer \$7 million to their children without any estate tax, only 0.05 percent would be subject to the estate tax.

So in myth number 1, a study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that after all repeal of the estate tax, and that is where the other side is headed, the largest 4,500 estates, therefore the wealthiest 0.003 percent of all the taxpayers will receive as much relief from the repeal as 142 million Americans.

Myth number 2: The estate tax is forcing family farmers to lose their farms. We could not find one farmer who was losing their farm, and then they try to quote from the American Farm Bureau Federation, and they could not find one farmer who lost their farm either. And as far as I am concerned, the American Farm Bureau Federation is just like the National Association of Manufacturers, they talk, do no good, and we continue to export

jobs overseas. They are both worthless. Tell a lie enough times, and folks might believe it. The small farmers are not represented by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Myth number 3: The estate tax stifles creativity and innovation by punishing the successful. Listen to what Andrew Carnegie said about that myth, that each generation should "have to start anew with equal opportunities. Their struggles to achieve would, generation after generation, bring the best and the brightest to the top."

Warren Buffett was quoted from this floor just a week ago, there is no free lunch.

Myth number 4: Taking 55 percent of someone's life earning is unfair. That is a myth. Conservatives, particularly on the other side, do not let facts get in the way of political ideology. The effective tax rate, which is the percentage of an estate, which is actually taxed, does not even come close to 55 percent, Mr. Speaker, and they know it.

In 1999, the effective tax rate on all estates was only 24 percent, less than half of the 55 percent reported. The 24 percent effective rate leaves heirs 76 percent of the value of the estates.

Mr. Speaker, do not let Americans think you are going to help them on this estate tax when we are talking about a tiny percent of the population. The other side of the aisle is trying to create that myth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the estate tax is double taxation. Do you want a list of those poor people in the middle class that we double tax on issues? There are a lot of ways that we tax beside the income tax. This is a myth and they have quoted from folks that do not even support the position. This vote that we will take on Thursday is one that everybody should look at the facts, not how things are perceived, not at how things look, look at who is being helped and look at the redistribution of wealth in this country, and we will see who is guilty of class warfare.

Without the estate tax, these assets would never be taxed. But that is exactly the point. Conservatives who argue that it is unfair to tax them twice are really trying to get out of having them taxed at all. Repeal of the estate tax means that huge amounts of capital gains would be passed on to children without ever having been taxed.

The fact that the estate tax also falls on a part of an estate made up of previously taxed income is not problematic because it is no different than how any other income is treated. Under our tax system, the same dollar is taxed multiple times as it moves through the economy from employer to employee to a gas station and then on to the next employee, ad infinitum. It is unfair and inconsistent to single out the estate tax for exemption from this system.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

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

There was no objection.

#### WAR IN IRAQ AND ASSOCIATED TRAGEDIES NOT OVER

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the American people needed evidence that the war in Iraq and its associated tragedies are not over, it arrived in a front page picture Saturday that was carried across our country. In my hometown paper, the Toledo Blade, but also the Chicago Tribune, the Boston Globe, the Washington Post, and the New York Times.

This is the photo, First Class Sergeant Bryan Pacholski comforting David Borell, career Army guard, both from Toledo, at a military base in Balad, Iraq. The Associated Press photograph caught an emotional moment, a Toledo career soldier being consoled in his grief by a buddy after military doctors allegedly refused to treat three Iraqi children with painfully serious burns from some sort of explosive device. The soldier, Sergeant David Borell, of our 323rd Military Police Company, later wrote home an e-mail with his personal thoughts on the incident, specifically that the children had been unjustifiably denied medical treatment.

The Blade printed the story and a request on my part of our Secretary of Defense for a full investigation and a meeting with him in order to discuss how to prevent this type of situation in the future. Such an investigation is warranted because the incident, if true, flies in the face of numerous stories from the war zone telling of humanitarian acts by U.S. troops under hostile circumstances. We know our troops want to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, is it really U.S. policy to refuse treatment of Iraqi civilians with serious but nonlife-threatening injuries? Who made that decision? Who were the doctors involved, and why did they handle the situation as they did? Were the kids callously refused care, or was the sergeant simply overcome by witnessing their great pain? These are some of the questions that deserve straightforward answers.

The Blade, in its editorial, goes on to write, "Given frequent news reports about the destruction of Iraq's hospitals and emergency services, of which

we are all aware, and the 10-year embargo preceding the war that caused all of their hospitals to lack medical equipment and supplies, it is difficult to give much credence to a spokesman for the U.S. Central Command who contended that Iraq now has a better health care system than before the U.S. occupation. It is entirely believable that in the words of the same spokesman, U.S. forces in Iraq 'are providing health care to Iraqis, but we do not have the infrastructure to support the entire Iraqi civilian population.'"

□ 1830

So whose fault is that? And what do we do? What do we do to build friends, more friends than enemies inside Iraq?

Most Americans probably would say that defenseless children should be taken care of in any circumstance. They, after all, did not cause the war. There are plenty of adults around to blame for that. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has agreed that we will begin with a meeting with Under Secretary of Defense Chu, who is in charge of personnel and deployments. Hopefully, that first meeting will begin tomorrow. My proposal will be the same, that we move some of the funds we have already appropriated because we thought the war would last longer with the siege of Baghdad, divert some of those funds to move some of our temporary field hospitals in different places in Iraq, and to put medical supplies there to treat this type of injury that Sergeant Borell saw, children who are burned, people who are bleeding, civilians who we want to be our friends.

We now hold the ground in Iraq. The question is, in the future, will we win the hearts and minds of the people? There is no greater way to do that than one by one ministering to their tragic health needs. That time is long overdue. And so I welcome the opportunity to discuss this with Under Secretary Chu, with Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, and to make sure that no other soldier in service to this country will have to experience what Sergeant Borell experienced with no alternative given to him.

There were no kits, no medical kits that were available to the platoon other than their own small emergency kits, because they are military police. There were not hospitals in the area where these people could be referred that had decent medical supplies and backup. And so he was forced as an American to turn the family away. How do you think America is perceived by those civilians? I think they are beginning to wonder, at least that family, will America really make a difference? Yes, America really can make a difference, just give us a chance. I would welcome the opportunity as one Member of Congress to mobilize my community to provide the supplies for that first field hospital right near where Sergeant Borell and Sergeant Pacholski are serving. These are part of our flesh and blood from our commu-

nity. We want to give them all the support we can. I know the Secretary of Defense will find a way to help us.

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

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

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, currently both the House and the Senate are in intense deliberations to forge a compromise on a prescription drug benefit for Medicare and Medicare recipients. I am glad to see that both Republicans and Democrats after all this time are working together to try to correct this critical deficiency in the Medicare program.

When Medicare started in the early 60s, about 10 percent of the health care costs for a senior was dedicated to out-of-pocket drug costs. Today that is around 60 percent of their health care costs, or health care dollar. And so if we are going to have a health care plan for seniors and if Medicare is going to live up to its obligations that it was originally designed to do, Medicare must have a prescription drug plan.

We all know that one of the most contentious issues in the prescription drug debate is the question of how much of the cost of drugs should be paid by government and how much should be passed on to seniors. But the crux of this problem is that both the U.S. Government and American seniors are paying too much for prescription drugs. Providing a prescription drug benefit through Medicare is unfortunately only the tip of the iceberg in addressing a widespread prescription drug access issue facing our Nation.

Much more central to the inability of many seniors and other Americans to afford the prescription drugs they need is the fact that prescription drug prices are 30 to 300 percent higher than those in other industrialized nations. The truth is one of the big problems we have here in the country is that we do not have a free market as it relates to prescription drugs and drug costs. I

really believe that one of the central points of this debate is that we need a free market.

The three things I am going to discuss today are, A, the issue that American consumers, be they elderly or others, are denied access to prescription drugs from all over the world and they are a captive market, unable to buy drugs, be they in Canada, Mexico, Germany, France, where the same drugs are much cheaper than they are here in the United States. If our consumers were allowed to have access to those drugs, there would be competition and prices would drop. But because the free market is prohibited from exercising its magic, drug costs are artificially raised.

The second point I want to discuss is the American taxpayer through two different venues provides direct and indirect assistance to the drug companies to develop the drugs. Drug companies reap all the profits, and the American taxpayers do not get any of the benefits back as an investor. If we were an investor, and I come from the private sector, private sector investors when they invest in a drug, they usually look for what is called a 30 percent IR, investment return on equity. Yet the taxpayer who provides through taxes both direct assistance to the FDA as well as through the tax write-off that pharmaceutical companies get, they do not reap any of the benefits from these drugs being developed. Yet we develop these drugs, taxpayers spend billions and billions of dollars helping develop these drugs, yet the only benefit they get besides taking the drug is they pay the highest premium price out there.

I believe the right way to get the prices under control is for the investor, known as the American taxpayer, to reap the benefits of their investment dollars. And, third, deal with the area of generics and generic markets. If we allowed generics to get to market quicker, it would also create that type of competition. I think one of the problems we have here is that the American elderly, the American taxpayer and consumer have an artificial market that is in three areas, generics, taxes and access to the same drugs in other markets around the world. Because we are a captive market, we pay artificially high prices; and the American seniors specifically are the profit margin or, as I like to call them, the guinea pig profit margin for the pharmaceutical companies. I want the free market to work. The pharmaceutical companies are treating this market as a captive market. If we had a free market, we would have reduced prices.

Medicare drug benefits being considered by Congress are very expensive. Many seniors, especially those who do not have secondary insurance, will continue to have significant out-of-pocket drug costs even with the passage of a Medicare drug benefit. In addition, the high cost of drugs remains a crisis for 42 million uninsured and countless underinsured who must pay all or most

of their drug costs out of pocket. Addressing the cost of prescription drugs will both make a Medicare drug benefit less expensive for the government and greatly increase the value of what is provided for our elderly. It will also make it much more likely that millions of uninsured and underinsured in this country can afford lifesaving, life-preserving prescription drugs, what their compatriots in Germany, France, England and other industrialized nations get. Prescription drug companies are a business, and they need to earn profits in order to stay in business. But as they have the right and purpose like other businesses to earn a profit, they also have a responsibility to be a good corporate citizen and abide by the same standards as other businesses.

As I said, I have worked in the private sector. I know that any private company when investing in research and development and in another company usually looks for a 30 percent return on their equity. The United States Government invests in pharmaceutical research by providing significant tax benefits for research and development expenses and American citizens subsidize the research as drug companies recoup their margins in America because of price controls in other countries. The American Government and the American people are getting no return on their investment. The pharmaceutical companies are reaping the financial benefits of the U.S. investments in their R&D without any responsibility to pass these benefits on to the government and American taxpayers.

American consumers are bearing the burden of price controls in other countries. When 50 tablets of Synthroid cost \$4 in Munich and \$21.95 in the United States, the most vulnerable Americans suffer. Also it is one of the great reasons that we have inflation running at close to triple or quadruple here in health care in the United States as opposed to the market as a whole. We are using individuals as the profit guinea pigs for pharmaceutical companies.

The legislation introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), last week takes important steps to address the shocking disparities in prescription drug prices between the U.S. and other industrialized nations. It puts essential safety precautions in place to ensure that by opening our markets, we do not expose Americans to the dangers of counterfeit drugs. When defending the high cost of prescription drugs in this country, people will often say that the U.S. has the best health care system in the world. People come here from overseas to get a better product. But we clearly have nothing close to the best prescription drug delivery system, as many individuals are now shopping overseas for their prescription drugs. If we are going to defend our status as the best place to get health care in the world, we need to make the pillar of many

people's health care, prescription drugs, accessible and affordable.

I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois for taking a leadership role on this important issue. This is a huge issue. Members need to know that the estimate that the Congressional Budget Office is currently using is that seniors alone over the next 10 years will spend \$1.8 trillion on prescription drugs. As the gentleman alluded to, I have been doing research. I should not say I have been doing research; there have been groups who have been sending me research for the last 4 or 5 years in terms of these great disparities between what Americans pay for name-brand prescription drugs versus the rest of the world. We have heard a lot about Canada; we have heard a lot about Mexico. But what has intrigued me the most is the differences between what we pay in the United States and what they pay in the European Union.

What I have here is a chart of about 12 or 13 of the largest-selling prescription drugs. This chart is old and the numbers have changed, but the percentages remain the same. This information is confirmed by research that I have done, that others have done, several groups have done this; but let me just run through a few of these examples. Augmentin, sold in the United States for an average of \$55.50. You can buy it in Europe for \$8.75. I have examples of these drugs. We actually went to Germany and bought some of these drugs. This is Augmentin. This is Cipro. Cipro is made by the German company Bayer. They also make aspirin. As you can see, it is a very effective antibiotic and especially in the days when we had anthrax here in the Federal buildings, we bought an awful lot of Cipro. In the United States it sells for an average of \$87.99. In Europe you could buy that same package of drugs for \$40.75 American. Claritin, \$89. It is \$18 there. Coumadin, this is a drug that my father takes. He is 85 years old. It is a blood thinner, a very effective drug. Coumadin in the United States at that time was selling for about \$64.88. In Europe you can buy it for \$15.80.

And the list goes on, but let me give an example, and the gentleman from Illinois, I think, made a great point about the amount that American taxpayers spend to develop these drugs. This is a drug that really chaps my hide. This is a drug, Tamoxifen. In many respects, this is a miracle drug. It is probably the most effective drug against women's breast cancer that has ever been invented. This drug we bought at the Munich airport pharmacy for \$59.05. We checked here in the United States. This same package of 100 tablets of Tamoxifen in the United States sells for \$360; \$60 in Germany, \$360 here.

As I say, the evidence is overwhelming that most of the research,

and I have a report if any of the Members would like a copy, this is a Senate report done in May of 2000, and in the Senate report, if I could just read into the RECORD, the National Cancer Institute, part of the NIH, has sponsored 140 clinical trials of Tamoxifen. It also participated in preclinical trials consisting of both in vitro, laboratory and live-subject tests. In other words, here in a Senate report we have confirmed that the taxpayers paid for much of the testing that was done on this drug.

He also referred to the drug Taxol. There was a story just a couple of weeks ago in The Washington Post. Let me just quote some of these numbers about what the taxpayers paid to develop this drug and what the pharmaceutical company got out of it.

Bristol-Myers-Squibb earned \$9 billion from Taxol, which has been used to treat over a million cancer patients; but the National Institutes of Health received only \$35 million in royalties. You go down the article a little bit further and it says, the GAO, the investigative arm of Congress, said that the NIH spent \$484 million on research on Taxol through the year 2002. So the taxpayers invested \$484 million, took it most of the way through the research pipeline, and we got \$35 million back.

□ 1845

Mr. EMANUEL. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Can you repeat again for those who are watching, as you note, this is a miracle drug and all the investment the U.S. taxpayers did, repeat again so everybody knows the difference between the price overseas versus the United States for those two drugs.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Unfortunately, on Taxol I do not have that comparison. I do not think it is on my list, but the comparison is essentially the same. It is about three times more, or at least it was when it came off patent in the United States; it was more than three times more in the United States than they paid in Europe, and the American taxpayers paid for most of the R&D costs. By the GAO's own estimate, the taxpayers spent at least \$484 million developing the drug, and I yield to my friend.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask my good friend, I did not mean to interrupt him. Did he want to keep going?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No. I have plenty of information, but the interesting thing about these charts and these comparisons, if people doubt what they paid for these drugs, we have the receipts. So we can literally go through and say, yes, this is what we paid for Tamoxifen, \$59.05 in Germany, and we did not have a special discount card. We are not German citizens; so we were not going in for socialized medicine. These are drugs that we just bought off the shelf or from the pharmacist at the Munich airport. So it is not as if they are being subsidized by the German Government. The truth is they are

being subsidized by us, and what I have always said is that Americans should be prepared and we are prepared and willing. I think most Americans are willing to subsidize the research for these miracle drugs. In fact, I think we are willing to subsidize people in developing countries like Sub-Saharan Africa, but we should not have to subsidize the starving Swiss.

And finally, let me just make one last point, and I will yield back. I am with the gentleman. I happen to be a Republican. The gentleman is a Democrat, but we are both capitalists. We both understand that there is nothing wrong with the word "profit," but there is something wrong with the word "profiteer," and there is growing evidence now that the big pharmaceutical companies are actually spending more on marketing and advertising than they are on basic research.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. What I would like to do is I am going to turn to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), our good friend and my colleague from Illinois, in a second. I would like to repeat just one point on this. If you take this market on either cancer or AIDS drugs, just those segments or families of drugs, there is not a single cancer drug today or AIDS drug on the market that was not directly developed with assistance from the United States Government, NIH; and it was not directly developed with the tax dollars from the taxpayer; and yet the only benefit of those drugs, obviously besides using them and saving lives, the American consumer, be they the elderly or just families and children, they pay, as the gentleman noted, three times more than do people in Germany, France, and other major industrialized countries; and yet we were the ones who developed it.

We were the ones who gave the tax dollars to develop this. We also not only gave it from the NIH direct funding, using tax dollars to fund it, but on the back end these companies write off their R&D. So we have to make up that loss in the tax revenue pool so they can develop these drugs; and as I think the gentleman noted in his statistics, we then get a minuscule amount of return. Actually in the private sector money like that is called dumb money. That is how they refer to it. It is foolish money. It is called dumb money. It is people who put up dumb money, do not look for the 30 to 20 percent IR on equity, and that is what has been going on for years here in this country, and we are paying premium prices; and in these companies they figure that in Germany they are going to pay X, in Canada they are going to pay Y for the same drug, England is going to pay, and they have got to make up their margin. Whom are they making up the margin with? Our neighbors, our friends, our family members; and we funded this research, and we developed these drugs.

My view is I would love for the free market to come to the pharmaceutical

industry. It just has not. It is a protected industry by the United States Government, from the Tax Code to importation to the development of generics.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. EMANUEL. Yes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think he used the word earlier and I think it is the critical word. He said that we are a captive market, and if we look around the world, whether it is beef and Japan or blue jeans in the former Soviet Union, anytime there is a captive market, what will happen is they will create an artificial price barrier which will guarantee that the consumers will pay outrageously higher prices, and that is what has happened here in the United States. The German pharmacist has the right to go anywhere within the European Union and buy this Tamoxifen where he can get it the cheapest for his consumers. That is part of the reason that Tamoxifen is \$60 in Germany and \$360 here in the United States. In fact, the companies are protected by our own FDA from any real competitive pressures which would help to keep prices down. And I do not say shame on the pharmaceutical industry; I say shame on us. They are only exploiting a market opportunity which our government has given them.

Let me just share with the gentleman and other Members from a book called "The Big Fix" because I think it helps tell the whole story by Katharine Greider, and she quotes a study that was done in 1998 by the Boston Globe, and they looked at the 35 highest-selling prescription drugs in the United States; and they claim, the Boston Globe, and then is repeated in the book "The Big Fix," that 32 of the 35 largest-selling drugs in the United States a few years ago were actually brought through the research and development chain by the taxpayers through the NIH, the NSF, the Defense Department, or other Federal agencies, principally the NIH. So it is not shame on them, but it is shame on us. We do not get a rate of return. We get nothing except for millions of our consumers the highest prices in the world, and it is time for us to change that.

Mr. EMANUEL. I thank the gentleman. If he could yield, I would like to now ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my good friend, who has joined us here to also speak about his district in Chicago that borders mine, but also about this issue as it relates to the pharmaceutical industry and prescription drugs and what is going on.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. EMANUEL), my neighbor and friend, for organizing this Special Order and certainly for giving me an opportunity to participate. Our districts abut each other; and as a matter of fact, I guess before now some of what is my district was his district.

Maybe some of what was his district is my district. So we have many similarities and certainly represent some of the same people and some of the same thoughts. It is no secret that I am a supporter of the notion of reimportation of prescription drugs. As a matter of fact, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 847 introduced by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), my good friend.

Some people might ask me why do I support the concept of reimportation of prescription drugs, and I generally say to them it is no real big deal if they understand as I do, but I do it for a lot of reasons. One, the increasing use of prescription drugs has revolutionized health care. As a result, spending on prescription drugs has increased at a rate of 12 to 13 percent a year for the past decade and will continue to increase in cost at that rate for the foreseeable future. Prescription drugs are the fastest-growing portion of State health care budgets, and many States are facing serious budget crises relative to being able to come up with enough money to actually operate. Yet millions of seniors, perhaps tens of millions, are skipping doses of their prescribed medication or splitting pills or facing a choice between food on the table or taking their prescription drugs. I know this because of the statistics. I know it because of the recent studies. I know this because every weekend when I go home, I hear about this dilemma from one or more seniors in my district.

Meanwhile, the pharmaceutical industry remains the most profitable sector of the U.S. economy with profit-to-revenue ratios of over 18 percent. I heard the gentlemen discussing profits and being capitalists and living in a capitalistic environment; and like them, I do not have a problem with profits, but I do have a problem with overcharging our seniors. So when I learn that Glucophage for diabetics is 74 percent cheaper in Canada than in the United States, I have a problem with that. When I learn that Tamoxifen for treatment of breast cancer is 80 percent cheaper in Canada than in the United States, I have a problem with that. Time does not permit, but I could easily go on and on with the list of prescription drugs available outside the U.S. at a fraction of the cost to my constituents, and when I learn that almost 80 percent of the ingredients of prescription drugs are imported, that redoubles the problem I have with the cost of prescription drugs in the United States. And when I learn that these prescription drugs are developed with millions upon millions of dollars of Federal tax money, I have a serious problem with the cost of prescription drugs in the United States.

I know that reimportation is not the sole or even most important element in providing affordable prescription drugs for our people. I for one will not rest until we have real and effective prescription drug coverage preferably as

part of a system of universal health care. But absent a comprehensive solution, there is no excuse in denying Americans the same access to prescription drugs enjoyed by our Canadian neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the prescription drug industry is sick, and that sickness is endangering the health of all America. Reimportation would be a good first dose of castor oil to bring the industry back to a more regular and healthy state. So I want to thank my colleague and neighbor from Chicago again for organizing this complex discussion on the issue of prescription drugs and how we can get the costs down, and I yield back to him and thank him so much for the opportunity to participate.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. He brought up the breast cancer; was that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. EMANUEL. I think it illustrates again what our good friend from Minnesota said and has brought forth examples is that, in fact, there is not a drug today, and we can also expand this to medical choice, but no drug today that is not being developed and has not been developed that is around the country that any way you look around the world in the major industrialized countries where we have trading companies, and the gentleman noted wheat, meat, steel, cars, computers, all types of products where there is "free trade," and yet here in this specific area, we are paying top price, high-premium dollar. I think again, whether it is diabetes, breast cancer, there are other drugs that are on the market that affect other types of illnesses, and I think the gentleman highlights a very important point, especially given his district and my district that about each other, how this creates inflation, and besides the uninsured, the cost of pharmaceutical drugs is the single largest cause for health care inflation in the health care industry which has been running at 20 to 30 percent of inflation.

So he brings up, I think, a very good point, and I think it is relevant to the discussion we are having today. What I am most impressed with is the bipartisanship we have here in discussing this. And I think the truth is, and I would love to hear both their thoughts on this, that while we are doing a drug prescription benefit and we are talking about it in the Senate and we are going to be taking it up here in the House, without some type of ability to have competition in that process, we are really going to be offering a benefit at top dollar, and I think, as American taxpayers are going to be paying for the prescription drug benefit that we are going to add to Medicare, we should give them a sense of competition in the market so that we can find that drug cheaper in Canada, we can find that drug cheaper in Mexico or Germany, France, or England. We want to bring that so we can squeeze the most coverage out of our prescription drug plan for Medicare.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Absolutely. And one does not have to be on Medicare or Medicaid to feel the bite.

Mr. EMANUEL. Right. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois, my neighboring colleague from Chicago, because I know not only is he leading on this issue, but he is leading on creating a proposal that fits within our budget. And there is a very important point here, that we are going to make a promise to America's seniors and they are going to count on that promise. So that promise has to be sustainable and affordable. By crafting a proposal which fits within the budget resolution, my colleague from the other side of the aisle is crafting a serious proposal and is joining in the debate in a particularly productive way, and I want to compliment him on that.

Mr. EMANUEL. I appreciate that. I yield again to the gentleman from Minnesota if he had some additional comments because I have some other things, but I would like him to go ahead.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, let me just talk about a couple of things, and I think as we talk about this new benefit, and I think we all recognize there are far too many seniors that are not getting the prescription drugs that they need, there was a study done several years ago by the Kaiser Foundation, and they found in their survey that 29 percent of seniors responded that they have had prescriptions which they did not have filled because they could not afford them, 29 percent.

Mr. EMANUEL. So that is about one third.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. About one third. And I say shame on us because we have the power to do something about that.

□ 1900

I spoke several weeks ago to the Community Pharmacists, and I just had received this report from the Kaiser Foundation. I asked them as I looked out over this audience of roughly 300 pharmacists from all over the United States, "Has this ever happened to you, where seniors come into the pharmacy, they hand you a prescription and you tell them how much it is going to be, and they drop their head and they say, 'well, I will be back tomorrow,' and they never come back?"

Shame on us. Shame on us. We need to do something about that.

But as has been mentioned by several of my colleagues, if we go about this in the wrong way, we may not do enough to really help those seniors who really need the help. But, worse than that, we may bankrupt our children, and there is something wrong with that.

Let me also mention that we are moving ahead with this, and we have heard some of the sponsors of the various bills say, oh, but we will have these groups, and get very significant discounts and really good deals on prescription drugs.

Well, this is a study recently done by one of the cardinals of the Committee on Appropriations, and they literally went through and found out how much the Federal Employees Benefit Program is paying for some of these drugs. It is rather eye-opening.

There are some areas where they are actually getting good discounts and are competitive with the prices they get in Europe. But let me give you some examples. The Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan, for example, on Coumadin mentioned earlier, even with their discount, the combination of what the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan cost is, and you add in the beneficiary cost, the total cost for Coumadin under the Blue Cross Blue Shield plan for a Federal employee is \$73.74. Now, Coumadin can be bought for \$15.80 in Europe. So \$73, that is the Federal plan. You read down the list of all kinds of other drugs. It is very similar.

Zocor, the total cost for Zocor under the Federal plan, Zocor is one area where it actually is cheaper, but not much cheaper. With their deep discount, the total cost is \$17.48. That same drug in Europe would be \$28.

But as you go through the list, what you find is in virtually every category, even with these "deep discounts" that the Federal employees' plan is able to get, it still is significantly more than the average consumer gets them for in Europe.

One final point, if I could, the argument that many people make against reimportation is safety. But what about safety?

Mr. EMANUEL. That is a very important point.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We import every day thousands of tons of food. It surprises me how many tons. In fact, the number I remember is we import roughly 318,000 tons of plantains every year, and every time we eat a plantain that comes in from a foreign country, we take a certain amount of risk, because that could contain some food-borne pathogen.

We keep very good records on how many people get ill from eating imported foods. Let me give a couple of examples. In 1996, 1,466 Americans became seriously ill eating raspberries from Guatemala, 1,466. The next year they did a little better. Only 1,012 Americans became seriously ill from eating raspberries from Guatemala.

The point I am really trying to make here is we take a certain amount of risk. I believe that the risk, particularly with the new technologies, and I am holding in my hand a tamper-proof, counterfeit-proof package for pharmaceuticals.

Here is one that is currently in use by the company AstroZenica. This is the first version of the tamper-proof, counterfeit-proof packaging. So this whole issue of safety relatively speaking, even today, it is very, very safe.

But with the new technology that is going to be coming on line, I am holding in my hands, and you cannot see

this, but a little vial, and inside this vial there are 150 microcomputer chips. They are so small you can barely see them with the naked eye. But this literally is the next version of the UPC code.

Within 2 years they will be embedding these chips into packaging, so that we absolutely can know that this package of drugs was produced at the Bayer plant in Munich, Germany, on September 8 of this year, and was shipped to so and so.

So the whole idea that we cannot do this safely, it seems to me, is a specious and almost goofy argument. So I do not think we should even engage in it. It can be done, it is being done. It is far more safe to import drugs than it is raspberries from Guatemala.

Mr. EMANUEL. The only reason I had a smile cross my face is when you said the word "embedding," I said who knew the Pentagon was going to be so far ahead of the pharmaceutical industry, and now they are going to copy from them.

But the truth is, we all were exposed in the '80s and '90s to the notion of the \$500 hammer, where the Pentagon was off buying \$500 hammers, when if you just went down to the hardware store you could go down there.

The fact is, your chart up there shows exactly the similarity that is happening now to the American taxpayer and consumers, where you could buy these same drugs overseas in different markets for far cheaper than we are buying them here, and it is the equivalent.

And why is that? Just like the \$500 hammer, the fix is in. So if you go down the specific area, and I do not blame the pharmaceutical industry, they are playing the game just like they are supposed to play it, and they are rigging the game and system just like they are supposed to, for maximum profit.

But take it, whether it is in the generic drug laws or in our patent laws, they are keeping generic drugs off the market, therefore driving up the cost of name brand drugs, making it more expensive for all of us. If generic drugs were on the market and the system was not being fixed, you would have real competition.

What has happened is, the Wall Street Journal did a story the other day, as generics have started to come to market quicker and there has been a quicker process set in place by the FDA to approve generics, we have allowed that patent not to be gamed for an additional 30 months, we have, in fact, seen prices drop.

They have, in relation to the importation issue, pharmaceutical industries in that area have gamed the system very well, prohibiting us from buying the same type of drugs in either Germany, Canada, France, England, Italy, Israel, wherever, they have gamed the system. We are not prohibited from buying computers, cars, food items, other types of items. We are prohibited in this space.

What is the impact? Those same drugs, cheaper over there; more expensive here at home. Yet they are the same drugs we paid for the development.

Then through the Tax Code, the IRS, where we do an R&D tax write-off, where they are allowed and subsidized by the taxpayers for the research and development, yet they get a direct subsidy from the NIH.

I highlighted the area through the NIH of cancer drugs and AIDS drugs. Not a single drug in either one of those families has been developed without direct assistance by the government, yet, again, in that area we are paying prime dollar versus our brethren in the other industrialized nations.

So I actually take my hat off to the pharmaceutical industry, because they have worked the system to their benefit. Now, my hope is, if you go back in history and look at this in fact, when Medicare and Medicaid was first developed and voted on, it received overwhelming bipartisan support. Now, these are early preliminary stories in fact.

We are seeing right now that in the Senate, as they debate the prescription drug benefit for Medicare, we are seeing the early stages of bipartisanship, and we can discuss, argue, amend about the right approach. My hope is that when we have a chance here in the House, that that same bipartisanship would be approached with regard to the prescription drug bill, but that bill would include something on generics.

Over there they have a bill. Here, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has a bipartisan bill dealing with generic reform, dealing with the update of the patent laws as it relates to what the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) developed and passed in 1984 and Senator HATCH. I would hope that we would update our laws in the generic area. I would hope we could update our laws as they relate to importation.

And we have a bipartisan bill, the gentleman and I have. We have a generic bipartisan bill here. So we would keep that spirit and that tradition as it relates to Medicare, as it relates to prescription drugs, that, through and through, that bill would be bipartisan. I would hope, obviously, it can relate to some of the funding issues and recoup some of the investment our taxpayers have made through the direct funding through the NIH or IRS piece of the Code where we pay and subsidize pharmaceutical companies to do what is in their business plan, develop drugs.

I yield additional time to my good colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I appreciate the gentleman mentioning the bipartisan nature of this, because we did a special order last week, and we had Democrats and Republicans. We had some of the most conservative Republicans, and what I think most of us would agree are some of the most liberal Democrats, agreeing on this issue, and that is Americans should not have to pay

the world's highest prices when we are the world's best customers and when we spend more for the development of those drugs.

I am also the vice chairman of the Committee on Science. Just to share with my fellow colleagues how much we spend on research, and we should be proud of this, this year in this budget we will spend almost \$29 billion on various kinds of basic research. In fact, we represent as Americans less than 6 percent of the world's population; we represent more than half of all of the basic research done in the world. I am proud of that. But we should not have to pay for these drugs a second and a third time when we helped develop them.

We are not asking for special breaks. All we are asking for is fairness. Re-importation or importation is not a perfect answer, but we do know that markets are more powerful than armies, and ultimately markets, whether it is the market for grain or the market for diamonds, has a tendency to level prices all over the world.

Let me just mention one other thing, and I mentioned this in a 5-minute special order I did earlier. This is the June 9 issue of U.S. News and World Report. In it there is a true American patriot. Her name is Kate Stahl. She is 84-years-old and she describes herself as a drug runner.

The tragedy is that the American government treats her as a common criminal because she helps her fellow seniors through the Senior Federation of Minnesota acquire drugs from other countries at affordable prices. In the article she says, and this is why I think she is a patriot, "I would like nothing better than to be thrown in jail." That is a patriot. She is willing to do that for her fellow seniors so that they can get affordable prices on drugs.

Mr. EMANUEL. First of all, I thank the gentleman for organizing this and thank you for introducing your legislation. I think this is the right approach.

I think, again, whether it is the area of generics coming to market and updating our patent laws, whether it is the tariffs or limitations we put on importation or access to these drugs, the same drugs we see on the shelves in our pharmacies, that the American consumer has access to them, each of these, at least on the generic and re-importation, are bipartisan issues.

I think that this is the right approach, not only because it is bipartisan and it reflects our values and reflects a common set of values that we can come around, but, most important, is that in dealing with the issue of a prescription drug, the truth is, all these drug plans have some limitations. People will not be covered. So the question is, how do you squeeze the most out of that dollar? It may be \$400 billion over 10 years. The final product may be \$450 billion.

The question, though, we have to ask ourselves is, can we get more out of that? Can we get more people covered? Can more people get a plan, so their de-

ductible is not as high as it is? And the only way to do that is to make sure that a prescription drug plan as it relates to Medicare, as it relates to the cost of prescription drugs in the dime stores and drugstores and pharmacies across the country, can we reduce the prices? We can do that if we would bring the free market approach to the pharmaceutical industry.

So I applaud this. I am very pleased to be a bipartisan supporter and original cosponsor of the gentleman's legislation. I am on the generic drug legislation.

I think that approach comes together, not just because we are Democrats and Republicans, we come together on a common set of values. We approach this from the basis we may need more money for a prescription drug benefit plan, but we are going to make sure this \$450 billion over 10 years, we get the biggest bang for the buck, and that this game that has been going on, and they have been gaming the system, is going to come to an end.

We are not going to allow this to happen. We are not going to allow you to have frivolous lawsuits that keep patents on another 30 months. I want frivolous lawsuits to end. We are going to have them end. It is specifically how pharmaceuticals have been treating generic drugs and preventing them from coming to market.

We are not going to allow the pharmaceutical companies to keep up the game and not allow us to import the same drugs that overseas are at close to 30 percent to 300 percent cheaper than we pay here. And if you did that, you would be on your first step of controlling health care inflation that has been running at close to 20 to 25 percent, which is just suffocating our small and large businesses, who are seeing their insurance policies just go right through the roof.

The second item, obviously, and we may have a different approach to this, but the second item would be to insure the uninsured in this country. If you did that, and I also note when it relates to the working uninsured in this country, the only issue in which the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO agree on on health care, and they are both running campaigns, is we have got to insure the working uninsured.

□ 1915

They are showing up in emergency rooms, they are driving up the cost of insurance policies, and the hospitals pass that on to insurance policies, insurance policies pass it on to businesses, and businesses now pass it on to employees. And those two factors, controlling the cost of drugs and insuring the uninsured, would literally be taking the steam out of the pipe as it relates to health care inflation. If we do that, we will see immediately the health care tax alleviation for our middle-class and working-class families all across the country.

I applaud the bipartisanship and look forward to working with the gentleman

on this. Hopefully, we will get an opportunity to offer an amendment to the prescription drug bill when it is down here on the floor, because it is going to be essential in making sure that whatever dollars we spend of the taxpayers, that we stretch those dollars to the greatest possibility. I think the American people, if they knew that we had the opportunity to offer an amendment bringing free market principles, competition to this debate, to make sure that they got a return on their dollar of investment, to make sure that the pharmaceutical companies could not prevent other choices from coming to market, be they from overseas or in the generic area, they would applaud our work, Democrats and Republicans and Independents alike; people north, south, east and west would applaud us, because we would be coming around a common set of values that we all can agree on. So there will be places that we disagree, but on these there is bipartisanship. So that would be my hope. I think we will be successful if we can come together in this area, work together, make sure the principles of the free market and our values are reflected in what we pass.

So again, I want to applaud the gentleman for introducing this, bringing this to my attention, although I have talked to many people about it but, most importantly, being open to working together across party lines so we can represent the people we came here to, not only vote on their behalf, but to give voice to their values.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, just one last comment, and I thank the gentleman for this Special Order tonight. As we mentioned earlier, this is not a matter of right versus left, this is right versus wrong. It is simply wrong to make American consumers pay the world's highest prices for drugs which largely the American taxpayers helped develop in the first place.

The gentleman mentioned one other thing, and I think it is a very serious concern. Some people are saying, well, through these plans in Medicare, we will squeeze down the prices, but if we do not do something to bring market forces to bear on the overall cost of prescription drugs, what may well happen is the price for these prescription drugs will go up even more for those 41 million Americans that are currently uninsured. They are the ones who have to pay cash, they are the ones whose kids get sick with tonsillitis or ear infections or conjunctivitis, and they need those prescriptions as well.

So this is not just about helping to keep down the price of prescription drugs for seniors; it is for all consumers and particularly for those uninsured or partially insured Americans who pay the world's highest prices. Hopefully, on a bipartisan basis, we will ultimately begin to get at those issues, whether it is the whole issue of importation of prescription drugs or bringing the generics to market faster

so that Americans have those drugs at affordable prices.

But again, this is not a partisan issue as far as I am concerned. I look forward to working with the gentleman and other Members on the other side of the aisle because ultimately we owe it to every American to make certain that we get fair prices for the drugs that they desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) for this Special Order.

#### THE ILL EFFECTS OF ASBESTOS LAWSUITS ON OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, across our country, the state of our economy is the number one issue on people's minds. America's economy is reeling from a 3-year-old recession and the shock of September 11 and war jitters from Iraq. This Congress has acted to restore our homeland and national security. We have passed corporate reforms to stop the dot-com abuses that sparked our recession. Our Armed Forces have won a great battle in Iraq. But now, the latest news from our markets is somewhat encouraging. We bottomed out in the Dow Jones industrials at under 7,500, and we are now back over 9,000. But still, the economy is sluggish. Why? Are there other issues weighing against new savings and investments?

There are. There is one key issue that is casting a very dark cloud on America's economy, on our employment and, especially, our retirement savings. What is that issue? Lawsuits. Lawsuits. But not just any lawsuit. These are asbestos lawsuits.

Tonight, over 900 stocks that form the heart of our retirement IRAs are depressed because of asbestos litigation. We have already bankrupted manufacturers of asbestos long ago. People poisoned by these companies collect only 5 cents on the dollar from the empty shelf of what once were large employers.

In 1983, only 300 companies faced asbestos lawsuits from about 20,000 plaintiffs. Despite asbestos largely leaving our economy, we now see 750,000 plaintiffs suing over 8,000 employers. Sixty major employers have already closed their doors, and a third of those employers gave pink slips to their workers in just the last 2 years. With 8,000 plaintiffs crowding into our courts, no one gets justice. People who are truly sick die waiting for their day in court and the health care that they need. Others who file a case wait in line, hoping to win the asbestos lottery for them and their personal injury lawyers.

Our system of bankrupting employers and depressing the IRA savings of

America could make some sense if those who are sick are compensated, but the data shows different. From 1980 to 2002, employers and insurers paid \$70 billion in claims. Plaintiffs received only \$28 billion out of the \$70 billion paid. So where did the other \$42 billion go? As the chart next to me shows, it went to personal injury lawyers and court costs. Not a penny of those funds went for hospital costs or to pay surviving relatives. Sixty percent of funds under the current system go to lawyers and court costs.

Clearly, American justice can do better. We say, "Justice delayed is justice denied." But justice is delayed here. We say, "We built a system to make the injured whole," but the injured are not made whole here. Supreme Court Justices have decried our wayward system of asbestos justice. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg called on Congress to act. Justice David Souter said the system was an "elephantine mass" which defies customary judicial administration, and calls for national legislation.

What happens if we do nothing? What happens if we leave well enough alone? According to the National Economic Research Associates and the Rand Institute, asbestos litigation costs 60,000 Americans their livelihoods. Without reform, Rand estimates 423,000 Americans will lose their jobs because of the expanding cloud of asbestos litigation. Never in the history of our economy have so many lost their incomes to so few who received so little for the benefit.

Asbestos litigation reform may be the most important remaining economic reform legislation for this Congress to pass. Reform means saving half a million American jobs. Reform means lifting the value of millions of IRAs. Reform means paying victims and their families with the lion's share of awards, not personal injury lawyers. And reform is needed now. Congress has several proposals before it.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 1114, the Asbestos Compensation Act of 2003, with 40 cosponsors, the largest number of asbestos reform cosponsors for any legislation in this Congress. My colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), introduced H.R. 1285, the Asbestos Compensation Fair Act. Our Democratic colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), introduced H.R. 1737. And in the Senate, Senator NICKLES introduced S. 413. All eyes in Washington on this issue have now focused on Senator HATCH's bill, S. 1125, the Fairness in Asbestos Injury Resolution Act, or FAIR Act. It is scheduled for a markup in the Senate in 48 hours.

This is the most important economic legislation for this Congress. And what do all of these bills do? They are based around core principles of American justice. One: that we seek to compensate the injured; two, that we bring about a rapid resolution of disputes; three, that decisions become final; and, four, that we administer justice uniformly. Our

current system fails to meet any of these time-honored values.

The legislation Congress is considering would remove the myriad of cases from various courts in States to a new Federal court or office that would develop an expertise and uniform administration of 8,000 lawsuits. Why do this? Let me give some examples.

Robert York received an asbestos award from his State court. He was asymptomatic with lung scarring, and he got \$1,200. He had to pay \$600 of it to his lawyer. Bill Sullivan was exposed to asbestos, with no symptoms, still got \$350,000. Keith Ronnfeldt was exposed to asbestos and he got just \$2,500, but, of course, had to pay \$1,200 to his lawyer. Mrs. Keith Ronnfeldt was exposed, but she got just \$750 and, of course, had to pay \$375 to her lawyer. Ron Huber got asbestos-related illness and received an award of \$14,000, but it is still pending appeal, and Ronald has not been paid. Meanwhile, James Curry, with asbestosis, won an award of \$25 million; but once again, under appeal, he has not been paid.

This is not justice. Victims are left to die, and plaintiffs with no symptoms are litigants in a system that only the lawyers win.

We stand for a different principle. The major themes of reforms are to form a new Federal office or court to swiftly and surely compensate victims. But who pays?

Under our reforms, current defendants, employers, and insurers pay, with some leeway for other defendants to be added. Without reform, Rand estimates, plaintiffs, uninsured and insured alike, will be awarded \$200 billion, bankrupting dozens of employers and throwing 400,000 Americans out of work.

But remember, most award money goes to lawyers and court costs, not to plaintiffs. That means without reforms, \$200 billion will be awarded, but only \$80 billion will go to victims and uninsured plaintiffs.

We argue for a better system. Rather than have only \$80 billion paid to victims, we, for example, under Senator HATCH's reforms, would pay over \$100 billion, 20 percent more, to the victims. Who loses? Under our reforms, only the lawyers would lose, but the victims would win; and so would the American economy.

□ 1930

So would the American economy.

Without so many asbestos lawsuits filed by thousands on the chance of victory, we would remove a cloud of litigation from our economy's future. We would also follow another key principle, those injured should be the ones compensated best and first.

Under the current system, plaintiffs with the fastest lawyer, suing the richest defendant, wins. The sickest plaintiff, suing a poor or bankrupt defendant, loses. That is wrong. Our reforms care for the sickest most, regardless of financial capacity of the defendant.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune identified these issues clearly in a masthead editorial printed yesterday. They correctly pointed out that the proposed privately funded \$100 billion trust fund will be more than adequate to meet the needs of victims who currently only look like they will get \$80 billion under the current misguided system.

Mr. Speaker, if one's 401(k) looks like mine, it is really probably just a 201(k). This issue depresses the market and, therefore, the retirement savings for millions of Americans. I ask everyone to contact their representative or Senator and urge them, for the sake of their retirement savings, to pass asbestos liability reform. If we are to return to \$10,000 on the Dow or even better, this reform must pass.

In the next 48 hours, the Senate is scheduled to act and the House must soon follow. There is no economic issue more important, and therefore, this must move to the top of the to-do list for the United States Congress.

#### WOMEN'S ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, we have had wonderful debate in these halls, both this evening and during the week, on issues of great significance to the people of this country. I am here today to speak to the determination and grace of women in transcending the hurdles they face on a daily basis as they lead others along the paths they have carved out for future generations.

While it is true, Mr. Speaker, that we stand here tonight highlighting the many obstacles faced by women on a daily basis, I would like to take these next few minutes to focus on the strength and dedication exemplified by so many women in my rural district in eastern North Carolina, the First Congressional District.

The First District transcends hurdles and lead others along the paths they carved out, these women, for our future generation. The women of eastern North Carolina are many things. They are mothers and wives and sisters and daughters. They are doctors and lawyers, teachers, cooks, business owners and preachers. Most of all, these women are leaders.

Tonight, I am proud to share with my colleagues stories of women who lead with distinction every day in areas of education, the political arena, housing, and economic development among others.

I can think of no better example to begin with regarding the success for women in leadership than my predecessor in these halls, the honorable Eva Clayton, the first woman to be elected from North Carolina and one of only three to ever join the North Carolina congressional delegation.

For 10 years, the First Congressional District made history with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. Clayton) at the helm, leading the way on so many issues, among them minority farming, agriculture, housing, education and community and economic development, and her passion, hunger.

Congresswoman Clayton carved out a path upon which I am proud to follow.

Women in eastern North Carolina are leading the way in areas of housing, but while the ownership rates are increasing, women still lag considerably behind the general population in homeownership.

One woman in Wilson, North Carolina, is helping entire communities realize the dream of homeownership. Her name is Fannie Corbett. She served for more than 31 years with the Wilson Community Improvement Association, being a founding member in 1968. Ms. Corbett and her colleagues have spent the last 3 decades moving from improving existing housing to initiating the building of more than 200 houses for families in the Wilson community, including playgrounds, arts, crafts, computer classes, Bible studies and exercise programs.

Women around the country are building quality, affordable housing as they try to help their neighbors, friends and themselves improve their lives. For 31 years, Ms. Corbett, who will retire at the end of this month, led the way.

Helping ensure the children of North Carolina receive quality education they deserve is Dr. Shirley Carraway, from Kinston, North Carolina. A lifelong education professional, Dr. Carraway served for many years in the Pitt County school system, one of the largest systems in my district.

As assistant school superintendent for Pitt County, Dr. Carraway's dedication to educating the young minds of our district saw her recently voted as head school superintendent for another North Carolina county.

On a national level, women lag behind men in earning doctoral professional degrees and are underrepresented in math and science. Dr. Carraway is leading the way to break down these barriers and open the doors of education for all children.

North Carolina ranks number 31 in the Nation for women in managerial and professional occupations and 32 in women-owned businesses.

#### HISTORY OF WOMEN'S RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will remain at the lectern, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, all of these women share one great quality, whether they are helping educate our youth, building houses for our families, creating jobs for our workers, or representing the people in the public arena. They all lead. These women are but a few women leaders from the congressional district that I represent.

I want to close by saying that there are so many other women that I could call on and mention in my remarks, but I know my time is short.

I do want to mention Joyce Dickens, president and CEO of the Rocky Mountain Edgecombe Community Development Commission and Andrea Harris, of Vance County, president of the Institute for Minority Economic Development. These and so many other women are blazing trails all over North Carolina and showing that women are great leaders, not only in North Carolina, but more particularly, in the First Congressional District.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I know that the women of his district very much appreciate the kind of attention he is paying to their accomplishments, in particular, and I know that his predecessor would have taken great joy in his remarks. Nobody could be more deserving of his remarks than Eva Clayton, and I thank him for taking the time to come to this floor during this special order when we are, in fact, looking closely at women's issues and women's rights.

First, in recognition of a former trailblazer and Representative Martha Griffiths. Martha Griffiths served in this House at a time when very few women darkened the doors of the House of Representatives, and she died April 22 at 91. Issues that we take for granted today were put on the map by Martha Griffiths so that as we celebrate her life and think of her passing, it seemed to me altogether fitting that we remember that much that women are grateful for today began with and owe to the extraordinary work of Representative Martha Griffiths of the State of Michigan, for it was Martha Griffiths who led the fight to add sex to Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and of course, for me, that one gets to be personal since it became my great honor during the Carter years to chair the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The notion that in the beginning sex was not even included as a form of discrimination can perhaps give us some appreciation for what it meant to have one good woman in the House of Representatives, along with a few others, and many men who supported her.

Of course, the 1964 Civil Rights Act that Martha Griffiths championed had a great deal more than Title VII in it. We remember Title VII because it is Title VII that bars discrimination in employment, and that has brought so many women equality in search for work and in the workplace, but the Civil Rights Act of 1964 barred discrimination based on sex also in public education, and I will have something to say about that in a moment because it relates to Title IX in public accommodations, in federally-assisted programs, and every day and every minute, women benefit from all of these sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which is remembered principally because it was African Americans marching in the streets to finally get enforcement of the 14th amendment that led the way to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, but race was not the only status protected in the 1964 Act.

Religion, national origin also have been, in our country, subjects of great discrimination, and they also are protected in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I say protected but it is important to understand that everybody's protected. We cannot discriminate against a white man because he is a white man, and we cannot discriminate against a black woman because she is a black woman. These particular groups had, in fact, borne the brunt of discrimination but the Civil Rights Act of 1964 protects each and every American.

□ 1945

We owe the work that got us there to Martha Griffiths.

Martha Griffiths also championed the Equal Pay Act and was one of the principal leaders that gave us the great Equal Pay Act that simply means if a man and a woman are sitting in the same workplace, you cannot pay one less than the other because of their gender. But perhaps Martha Griffiths is remembered most for having single-handedly revived the Equal Rights Amendment, which was only three States short of becoming an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

A word on who this great woman was. She was the daughter of a mailman, born in Michigan, attended its public schools, and went to the University of Michigan Law School and graduated in 1940. You can imagine a woman graduating from law school in 1940. The very fact that she went to law school says something about her determination and her character, because we are talking about a time when women in law school were as scarce as hens teeth. Undaunted, she practiced law with a very famous governor, G. Mennen Williams, "Soapy" Williams, a Governor of Michigan, along with her husband.

She served in the Michigan House of Representatives from 1948 to 1952. She was elected as a judge. And she served 10 terms right here in the House of Representatives. She was the first

woman ever to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means. She left the House to become Lieutenant Governor of the State of Michigan.

Here is a woman whose distinguished career just by virtue of the titles she has held would win her places in the history books, but Martha Griffiths was not looking for a place there because of titles.

I do want to tell the story of the addition of sex to title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Representative Smith, Congressman from the Deep South, introduced it with such levity that he brought the House down. In introducing the notion of adding sex to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, he said he had received a letter from a woman who complained that the 1960 census had reported, now here I am quoting him, "2,661,000 extra females and asking that he introduce legislation to remedy the shortage of men for women to marry."

Well, I mean, apparently, this House lit up so that they had to call for order, the laughter reverberated such throughout the House. And what did Mr. Smith say? And I quote him again: "I read the letter just to illustrate that women have some real grievances."

That is the atmosphere in which Representative Martha Griffiths had to somehow rally herself to respond. She rose in this House and pointed out that the laughter of the men of the House, or at least some of them, at the introduction of the amendment only underscored women's second class citizenship. A woman who thought well on her feet. Every woman in the House, except one, supported the amendment.

And, by the way, that was in defiance of the party discipline. The Democrats at that time did not favor, not until final passage, the addition of sex because women were protected by protective legislation in factories so they could take some time out to sit down and to have rest periods, to have breaks, for example, that men did not have. And they did not want to give that up, most of them under union contracts that had been won. But, hey, you cannot want equality and then want breaks. And, ultimately, the breaks went and the equality has come more and more ever since.

The passage in the House of title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act came after the passage of the Equal Pay Act. I must say that the early 1960s were a very good time for women, and it was Congresswoman Griffiths who led the fight in this House for passage of the Equal Pay Act.

We are now at the 40th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act; and it seems to me we ought to celebrate how far we have come, since you could with impunity sit in the same factory, in the same office, in the same law firm and have nothing to say if a man was paid more than you, as a woman, was paid. However, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a number of other women and men in the House

have introduced a very modest bill that would update the Equal Pay Act. It is called the Paycheck Fairness Act, and I hope every Member will go on the Paycheck Fairness Act, particularly during this 40th year of the passage of the act.

There are some updates that need to happen. For example, sex, but not national origin or race, are included in the Equal Pay Act. Fortunately, title 7 does allow a person to pursue unequal pay under title 7, if not the Equal Pay Act. A person can be punished by firing for telling what her salary is. That kind of sanction needs to be barred.

These are quite modest additions, and I would hope that this year the House would regard them as such and would pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. I had a more extensive bill, called the Fair Pay Act, Senator TOM HARKIN has introduced it in the Senate, that would update title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act so that jobs with the same skill, effort and responsibility, but not comparable, could be the subject of a title 7 claim if one could show that men and women were paid differently.

Now, the reason for this is perfectly apparent. If you are a probation officer and your wife is a social worker, guess who gets paid more? The probation officer. The point here is that we ought to look to see not whether it is the same job, but whether the content, the basic content of those jobs is equal; and that is what my bill would do. It would bring the Equal Pay Act into the 21st century.

The pay problems of most women today really do not come from sitting next to somebody who is a male who earns more than you do. It comes from sex segregation in jobs that women do. Two-thirds of white women and three-quarters of black women work in just three areas: clerical, sales, and factory jobs. And many of those jobs are molded to gender rather than to the job to be performed. My bill would say you have to look at the job to see if it is comparable to the job of a male. And if it is, in skill, effort, and responsibility, then it has to be paid comparably.

Without this kind of change, we are seeing the great so-called women's professions abandoned: teaching, nursing. Where are they going? They have gone where the pay is. And the pay is not in those jobs, because very often a teacher or nurse will find a man who has nowhere near the same skills making more money. So what happens then, of course, is people leave the profession. And we are in very deep trouble when those professions are abandoned. We had to pass a special bill last year to try to encourage more women to go into nursing.

Look at what has happened to the teaching profession. Even people who go into teaching often leave the profession. The same happens to nursing. Why do men not come into teaching and nursing? Because, of course, the pay is not what they expect. The way to do this is to look closely at these

jobs to make sure that inequality is not occurring or say good-bye to men or women who will enter these jobs.

By the way, what I am talking about is not as radical as it may seem. Twenty States have adjusted wages for women, raising the pay for teachers, nurses, clerical workers, librarians, and other female-dominated jobs that paid less simply by doing their own studies of the skill, effort and responsibility. If State governments can do this, I cannot be talking about something that is far out. What is far out is imagining an America where social work, teaching, and nursing are systematically abandoned. And that is what is happening today almost entirely because of pay.

The pay problem is structural. It is chronic. Look at what women have done. Women were told, look, go to school, get as much education as men, and that will take care of it. Well, girls are nothing but good little girls, and I will be darned if they did not go out and do just that. Women now earn 55 percent of college degrees. Men get something like 45 percent. They achieve 65 percent of the 3.5 GPAs.

Now, I do not relish this kind of inequality. I think the reason, very frankly, are the boys are out playing sports and girls are hitting the books. I do not like that a lot, but it certainly has not shown up in the paycheck. Doing so well in school, getting all of this advanced training simply has not paid off. That is why you hear women talking about equal pay. It still has not been achieved even under the Equal Pay Act.

An example in the private sector that was recently brought to my attention is one of a brand name famous retail outlet in our country, Wal-Mart, where women there make an average of \$1.16 per hour less than men.

We still need equal pay. We need to update the Equal Pay Act. We need to face the fact that when you have had this kind of inequality for the millennia, since human time, it takes enforcement of the law and it takes updating of the law.

This has become one of the great issues of the American family. The interesting thing about polling, is if you poll Americans, what are your top issues, equal pay keeps coming up near the top. You say how come if we are polling men and women, equal pay keeps landing up there in the stratosphere? I think I know why. In two-parent homes, almost always now, even in families that have very young children, both people go out to work. The male member of the household and the female member of the household are not unlikely to have been together in college, for example, or in high school. Suppose they went to the same junior college and graduated, both having done reasonably well. They hit the workplace and he instantly made more money than she does. And she is a drag on the family income. How come? They both went to college; they did well, yet

she does not earn anywhere near as much money as he does.

That is why it has become a family issue. That is why equal pay keeps registering when we give the American people a list of 10 issues and ask them to write the ones that mean something to them. Equal pay keeps hitting much higher, very high often within the first three of that family's sight. We better listen to them.

In this Special Order, where we are focusing on women, I do not want to leave the impression that women are looking only to so-called women's issues. I have just said that equal pay has become a major family issue in our country, as both parents go out to work, as the number of female heads of households grows astronomically. I want to look for a moment at the tax cut and what it does for women or does not do for women.

□ 2000

I think we need to lay this out as people decide what does this do for us. We hear about things like the tax cut in such gross terms that even if you are a tax lawyer, it is difficult to figure out what it means. For women, reduction of taxes on dividends, we are told that will help seniors because they are investments, reduce the dividends, greater return for them. Let me see, less than one-quarter of older Americans live in a family that receives any dividend income. Now, who knows what that dividend income is. But less than a quarter receive any dividend income.

That is of all older Americans. Only one-fifth of older women live in a family that receives any dividend income, and that is 20 percent. If we are looking at women of color who receive stock dividends, we are looking at 6 percent of black and Hispanic elderly living in families that receive dividend income. So much for women and the tax cut.

When we look at where at least some of the funds in the tax cut might have gone to benefit women, we probably should start with the uninsured, because uninsured women are far more likely to postpone everything. They postpone the care they need today, they skip all of the services like mammograms, they only go to doctors when they have advanced disease. Latina and African American women are 2 to 3 times more likely to be uninsured than white women, but if we had used the tax cut package, we could have insured 33 million of uninsured Americans with incomes below 300 percent of the Federal poverty level. Most of those people are women, often women with children.

If we look at the tax cut in terms of Social Security, and that is often the way the tax cut is positioned, think about women. It is women who have not been in the workforce who go in late so they do not have the pensions and the savings and the investments. They rely more on Social Security, far more than men do. Over 80 percent of unmarried elderly African American and Hispanic women get half their in-

come from Social Security. So if you took the 75-year cost of the tax cut, we could erase the entire 75 year shortfall in Social Security three times over and secure Social Security for the baby boom generation and future generations. We are going to be judged where our values were, and I always thought they were with Social Security, and I do not believe that is true anymore, at least with many in this House.

Another important issue with women has been domestic violence. I remember how we fought in this House and achieved a very important bipartisan consensus on domestic violence. We have a million and a half women assaulted by some partner each year. They have to go to shelters. They need residential shelters, services for their children, but we are able to handle only 1 of 5 women who needs somebody to take them in from an abusive partner. With just \$6 billion or 15 percent of the tax cut, we would have had shelter and transitional services for these women and their children. I do not know how Members can continue to talk about women and children and then wipe away all of the funds that they need to do what it is that we are talking about.

The Congressional Black Caucus today just had a very informative internal hearing on Head Start. I was very pleased to participate in that hearing because of the witnesses that came forward, one of them from a center in the District of Columbia where children emerge, and it is a bilingual center, the Beaumont Center, where children emerge literally bilingual. I asked the question and was assured that these children speaking only Spanish or Vietnamese or some other language emerge at kindergarten able to speak English, and that is what concerns me most, because that is when the brain is most pliable and people can learn language most easily. At that age, a child can learn more than one language, so these children do emerge bilingual. Head Start, I cannot say enough about it, but we are very concerned that it will be block granted and disposed of, because we know what happens to block grants: States steal from the block grants, often for people far better off than the block granted people. For the amount of tax cut, we could get to where everyone wants to get in providing Head Start for every eligible child.

Women continue to be the major guardians of our children, so when, in fact, we make the kinds of decisions we have been making on Head Start, we are taking money right out of the hands of children and not just their mothers.

I want to move on to title 9. Sometimes we forget since we talk about title 9 often in terms of sports, sometimes we forget title 9 covers all of education, and what it has wrought in approaching education equality is nothing short of historic.

In the year that the bill was signed, that was 1972, women earned only 7 percent of all law degrees. By that time I was out of law school. I graduated in 1964, and women were still earning only 7 percent. That is called tokenism. That is not representation in the profession. I have to tell if somebody went to law school and took the bar, it is not a profession that one would expect women not to enter.

That was in 1972, 7 percent. Fast forward to 1997, no longer 7 percent, 44 percent, approaching half. Before I came to Congress, I was a full-time tenured professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center. I joke, although it is not entirely a joke, that I continue to teach one course there a year. The House does allow a Member to teach but not to do virtually anything else outside of the House. I joke that I continue to teach because one thing I want to do is keep my tenure because it was harder to get tenure than it was to get elected, and there is a lot of truth in that.

But the fact is that I look at my classes, and I teach one course every year, and I am astounded. Not only are the classes often evenly divided, sometimes there are more women than men. In my wildest imagination, that is not what I foresaw for my profession, not when I was in law school.

Let us look at medical school. There were always a greater proportion of women in medical school, not a lot, because if we look at 1977, and that is 5 years after title 9, only 9 percent of all medical degrees were awarded to women. By 1997, 41 percent of the people graduating from medical school were women. This is the pattern in higher education for women. Looking at Ph.D.s, 1997, a quarter of the Ph.D.s went to women. Today 41 percent of Ph.D.s go to women.

Where we hear about title 9 most today, where we do not see this kind of progress, although we see considerable progress, is in athletics; and that has become somehow controversial. There are 32,000 women athletes playing intercollegiately in 1972, and 150,000 today. I would have never thought about intercollegiate athletics, not only because I am unathletic, but because it was not a girl thing to do. It is very important that athletics are open to women, not only for its own sake, but also because of what it means for how women can view where they can go in the world in other pursuits as well.

There were virtually no athletic scholarships for women in 1972, and today there are 10,000 scholarships for women athletes. There has been a lot of progress there. One would think that where there was this kind of progress, we would leave it alone. There is a lot of stuff to study in this House and in this country, but the fact is we just finished a very controversial, polarizing study, commission on title 9. I could think of a thousand commissions to set up where we see negative progress. The last thing I would spend

any time on is title 9; but why, because some wrestlers said they were losing out to women who were in fact given title 9 funds.

Give us a break. Thanks to women who protested this commission's work, not a lot has happened, but the commission's bias was astounding. Normally these commissions give the appearance of being open. There was one hearing, and not all sides were heard. There was no indication of continued discrimination against women in sports, no talk about how, for example, men's football and basketball really eat up the money from wrestling. It is somehow the fact that a few more women are playing intercollegiate ball that takes from the men.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know what happened on June 13. A district court threw out a lawsuit by a coalition of wrestlers who argued that title 9 requires quotas of female athletes that have resulted in discrimination against men.

□ 2015

The judge said nonsense. He said that the wrestlers failed to show that title IX caused their teams to be dropped. Let us look for the causal effect here. If they do not have a wrestling team now, what is the reason? And this judge found, hey, you cannot even show that if title IX had not been there at all, they would not have dropped the wrestling team. Why in the world do we not ask schools, is it really necessary to pump such large amounts of money into basketball and football? I will grant you that there is reason to put a lot of money there, but if you have got some wealth to share, do not take it from the wrestlers who then blame it on the women. Take a little bit from basketball and football. I do not think either of those sports, given the rah-rah spirit they have and the alumni they draw, are going to suffer from it.

The commission was certainly a very bad idea. There was a minority report by two commissioners who refused to sign the commission's report because of its detrimental possible effects on women. Then Secretary Paige said, fine, we have a unanimous report now. I mean, wait a minute. This is America. We do not do things that way. We acknowledge that there are differences, the majority rules; but we do not say, okay, we have a unanimous report and those people who did not sign simply are not counted at all.

Scandalously, some of the recommendations here hark back to the old days of discrimination. For example, the notion of the use of an interest survey to determine the level of interest women and men have in various sports. What? That builds discrimination on top of discrimination. The reason that girls like me did not have an interest in sports is we were literally taught that a smart girl did not do sports. Now of course that you do not have an interest in sports is why you should not have sports. That is like in

the days before title VII saying, let us ask the clients in this law firm whether they would in fact continue to do business with us if we had a black lawyer as a partner. That is exactly what that is like. Or a retail outlet saying, let us not hire this Hispanic person because we do not think people would like to be served by a Hispanic person in this store. I thought we called that discrimination. We do not ask people whether or not they should be given equal treatment in the provision of athletics based on whether they are interested or not. We say, look, if you are not interested, you do not have to do it; but we are not to condition your ability to participate in athletics on a survey as to how many of your gender are interested. That simply compounds the discrimination we are trying to escape. Profit from our own exclusion.

Since title VII, the opportunities for both men and women have increased, but the number of opportunities for women athletes, and, remember, there are more women than men in college, the number of opportunities for women athletes has yet to reach what it was for men before 1972. We need a commission all right. We need a commission to help us get to equal opportunity in athletics quicker than we have done. We need to pat ourselves on the back for how far we have gone and then move further.

I want to say a word about choice. When President Clinton was in the White House, I remember press conferences where women came forward to make the American people understand the notion of late-term abortions. Women came forward and spoke, gave testimony, some of the most moving testimony I have heard, about how their lives or their fertility had been saved by a late-term abortion.

We are going to have next week, or I am certain before recess we will have another spectacle. President Bush is going to invite anti-choice zealots into the White House to sign a bill taking away a woman's right to end a pregnancy not in the last weeks of pregnancy, but from 13 weeks on. That is how that bill reads. That is how a, almost exactly worded bill or worded in almost the same way was read by the Supreme Court. I am hoping that the Supreme Court will save us. Based on my own reading of the prior opinions of the Court, I believe they will; but it is a human tragedy that we have not been able to reach a compromise and that we now have a bill that would disallow the ending of pregnancies in the very last month or so.

The third trimester is already covered by *Roe v. Wade*, but because the procedure described in the bill is also used in the second trimester, I am certain it is unconstitutional, although nobody can presage what the Court will do. But I do know this, that no one is thinking about the health exception that *Roe v. Wade* has in it. That is the kind of response to women's reproductive needs we are seeing in this administration. Tragically, we see that we

are trying to carry these notions abroad where they are not wanted and where people have their own set of values. Why in the world were we at a U.N. population conference objecting to the very phrase "reproductive rights"? What? Wanting it stricken. Why did we object to the words "reproductive health services"? Representatives of the administration, of the State Department among U.S. delegates? Do reproductive rights necessarily mean abortion? Not the last time I heard. It is a very broad phrase. But the whole notion of trying to rewrite not only the English language here but rewrite the language for the world does seem to me to go beyond our writ and our right.

There are some women in here who are trying to restore the funds that we have now cut off from the United Nations population fund, funds that, of course, were meant only for birth control and contraception; and we have ourselves indicated that those funds will not be available to organizations which do not forswear using other funds for abortion. What this will result in in maternal deaths and the deaths of children will be on us.

Finally, let me say a word about poor women. We passed a TANF bill here. It has not been passed in the Senate yet. I can only hope that it will be thoroughly revised. Every State and the District of Columbia allows some of the time that a woman on TANF, some of the time for work to be spent in some form of postsecondary education. This is seen as an allowable work-related activity. In this House, however, no State would be allowed this flexibility so that a woman, for example, could work part-time and go to college part-time. Why not? Do you want women to get off of TANF and be on minimum-wage jobs for the rest of their natural lives? We want to make sure she is going to school, that she is pursuing a degree or some form of higher education. But why is that not exactly what we should be encouraging? It is almost impossible for poor women under the TANF bill we passed to have enough time available beyond weekly work-related requirements to do anything else, because we have increased the work-hour requirements to 40 per week and then limited what counts as work. What we were trying to do, I thought, was to make people less poor, not simply get them off TANF.

The final straw here was what we did just last week, in essentially killing the child care credit for poor women, poor families. Those are families that earn between \$10,000 and \$26,000 a year, including military families. By adding on the cost of child care for so many higher-income families, essentially we stabbed the bill in the back, knowing full well that the Senate required that the poor families be paid for and that if you add families of over \$200,000, for example, I would love to see it, I would love to have universal child care, we do

not have it, but knowing that if you added them, that would kill the bill, that is what this House did.

By the way, the House did not try to hide it. I will not call the House dishonest on this one. Member after Member was clear, said it to the press, said it on the floor, these people do not pay Federal income taxes; therefore, they should get no tax relief. The last time I heard, they were paying a greater share of their income in payroll taxes than most of us pay in income taxes. For the life of me, I do not understand why a child care credit, because that is all this is, it is a child care credit, it is for the child, would not be precisely what we want these families to have.

I give my friend TOM DELAY, and he is a friend, he and I wrote a bill together for family court in the District of Columbia, TOM never does hide where he stands. He said, "It ain't going to happen. There are a lot of things more important than that." That is a quote. You know what, he was right. It is not going to happen. The child tax credit is probably dead, killed in this House after the Senate tried to revive it.

Mr. Speaker, what I have tried to do in memory of Representative Martha Griffiths was simply to call the roll on some of the women's rights issues of special currency today. See, that is where Martha Griffiths would be. She would not be talking about the great feats of yesterday. She would be moving on. I wanted us to remember where these rights came from and that they came in a House where there were but a shallow number of women and a few good men, enough to pass the bill, indeed, without whom no bill could have been passed, who were determined that equality would apply to their wives, to their daughters, to their aunts, and to their mothers.

□ 2030

It is important that we know where this came from because it did not come from a House where, what do we have today, 63 women and a lot of men, Democrat and Republican, who respect and vote for women's rights and vote on women's issues as one might expect any civilized, advanced Nation to do. We have got a lot of that today. But in order to place the true value on where we have come in 40 years, it did seem to me one way to do this was to recognize the life of Representative Martha Griffiths, who had to stay on this floor and remind people that their laughter at the addition or the proposal to add sex to title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act simply underlined the second class status of women when women are not first class citizens yet, but nobody can doubt that they are on their way to being exactly that.

There are some ways in which we do not have consensus. I have named some of them. I have named more of them on which we do. There is one in which I hope we will gather consensus soon. H. Con. Res. 130, the Equal Access in

Membership Resolution is pending in the House, and its operative words say, and I cite this because this ought to be an easy one, and yet it is one that is not done, it says no Member of Congress, justice or judge of the United States or political appointee in the executive branch of the Government, should belong to a club that discriminates on the bases that have been named, and my colleagues know what they are, gender, race, et cetera. Come on, everybody. It even respects the right of free association because it does not say no Member must belong. It says no Member should belong. Can we not get at least that passed in the House?

And, remember, we are talking about a Member of Congress, a justice or a judge of the United States or political appointee of the United States of America, that if on is one of those, one is to forego belonging to a club that does not allow Jews and blacks and women in, Hispanics in. Is that too much to ask this late in the day? Hey, look, one can. All this resolution says is the House says one should not. It is because one gives the appearance of not being a fair person.

I hope that we will pass this resolution, this one we might have expected to pass during the height of the civil rights movement. We are all officials. It seems to me we want to give the appearance of fairness, and one way to do it is in the way we live our lives.

I hope that if I have done nothing else, I have pointed out not only our progress but our problems that we have both and that together we have come a very long way, and together we can get the rest of the way.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my salute to a remarkable woman and former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Martha W. Griffiths.

As a pioneering political activist woman, her life was a string of first. In 1953 she was appointed as the first female Detroit Recorder's Court judge; the following year, she was the first Democratic woman elected to Congress from Michigan; she was the first woman to serve on the Ways and Means Committee; she was the first woman lieutenant governor of Michigan.

Martha Griffiths passed away at the age of 91, just this past April and remains a legend in Michigan and National politics. She's been called a "legendary feminist" and "one of the most effective women's rights lawmakers of her time." Her reputation was well-earned. She was effective because she was as tough as any of her formidable opponents and she had a sharp intellect. At home she campaigned block-by-block, taking a small group of women to visit other women at home during the day to discuss political issues. She was just as methodical, strategic and persistent in Washington. Her work was richly rewarded with the inclusion of gender discrimination in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and by the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment in 1972. These efforts were watersheds in the progress of women's rights in America. From them, a multitude of Supreme Court decisions and Federal Laws have flowed in support of women.

Martha's progressive politics encompassed much more than women's rights, however. She was concerned about the welfare of all Americans. In the 1970's, she recognized the need for reforming our health system to provide universal health coverage and became an original co-sponsor of the landmark Kennedy-Griffiths Bill; she worked on regulating pension funds, closing tax loopholes and conducted a massive study of welfare, resulting in major overhauls to the system.

Martha Griffiths was, at once, ahead of her time and just right for her time. Her contributions to the evolution of human rights and dignity in this nation will be always remembered.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker and Congresswoman NORTON, thank you for the opportunity to support women's issues and to acknowledge the contributions of former Michigan Congresswoman Martha Griffiths to the cause of equal rights for women.

As the U.S. Representative from Michigan's 1st District, I am particularly proud of the example set by this dynamic, fiery woman, who was elected to the U.S. House in 1954 and served here for twenty years, including a term as the first woman on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Before her service in the U.S. House, Martha Griffiths served from 1949 to 1952 in the Michigan House, followed by two years as the first woman Detroit Recorder's Court judge.

Martha Griffiths was still in Congress when I began my career in public service as a police officer in Escanaba, Michigan in 1972. By the time she re-entered public life as Michigan's first elected female Lieutenant Governor in 1982, I was serving as a Michigan State Trooper.

In all that time, and later when I was elected to the Michigan State House of Representatives, I had Martha Griffith's example to follow.

While she was one of America's greatest women leaders, she was also at the top of the list of consummate politicians and public servants of either gender.

In her work reinvigorating the fight to pass the Equal Rights amendment and in adding language banning sex discrimination in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Martha Griffiths set the stage for later generations of women in politics.

My own wife Laurie, who is the elected mayor of our hometown of Menominee, is one of the thousands of women who benefited from Martha Griffiths' trailblazing work in politics and public life.

Martha Griffiths added influential roles in business to her resume after she retired from the U.S. House, serving on five major corporate boards, including two—Chrysler Corporation and Consumers Power Company—which had up to that time been all male.

A Detroit Free Press editorial on the occasion of Martha's death April 24 of this year summed it up beautifully.

The Free Press said, "Her very presence wielded power, especially when accompanied by her famously sharp tongue. Of course, her unabashed willingness to go toe-to-toe with the good old boys drew some detractors. An old man once wrote to Griffiths telling her to leave the political stage. 'All you've ever done is succeed in making women more insolent,' he wrote."

What this aging gentleman referred to as insolence we now applaud as assertiveness in such political leaders as Representative

NANCY PELOSI, Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm and the many women in state and local elected office like my partner in life Laurie. The thousands upon thousands of women who have climbed higher in business, community service and government in recent decades are also beneficiaries of Martha's efforts.

I do not have daughters.

But should I be lucky enough to have a daughter-in-law or granddaughters, I will be more than proud if they emulate even some of the self confidence, intelligence, perseverance and fierce effort that Martha Griffiths brought to all her causes.

We can best honor her legacy by continuing to work for equal pay and equal opportunity in the work force, continued support for widows and heads of households in Social Security and pension benefits, labor rights and a refusal to accept sex discrimination in any form.

I am happy to pledge my efforts to those goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this celebration of women's issues and Martha Griffiths' contributions to those causes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the extraordinary life of former Congresswoman, and my dear friend, Martha Griffiths. Martha was the matriarch of Michigan politics and one of the nation's greatest advocates for women's rights.

She grew up as the daughter of a rural mail carrier in Pierce City, Missouri, where she excelled in the art of debate. Her intelligence and strong spirit carried her all the way from Missouri to the steps of the University of Michigan Law School where she and her husband became the first couple to graduate together in 1940. After graduating from the University of Michigan Law School, she and her husband founded the law firm Griffiths & Griffiths in 1946.

With a top notch law school education and the creation of a successful law firm under her belt, Martha decided to run for a seat in the Michigan State House, and like everything else she did, she succeeded. Martha Griffiths was one of two women who held a seat in the Michigan House from 1949–1952.

In 1954, Martha Griffiths was the first woman elected to serve the great state of Michigan in Congress, where she held the seat for 20 years. While in Congress, she became the first woman to sit on the powerful Ways and Means Committee, she served on the Joint Economic Committee and she was Chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy.

During her tenure in Congress, Martha built her career fighting for equal rights for women. She fought to ensure the protections for women in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which outlaws discrimination in voting, public education, employment, public accommodations, and federally assisted programs. In 1970, she stalked the halls of Congress to obtain 218 signatures needed to file a discharge petition to demand that the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), which had languished in a House committee for 47 years, be heard by the full Congress. Congress overwhelmingly approved the ERA in 1972. Unfortunately, it was ratified by only 35 states, three short of the number needed to add it to the U.S. Constitution.

She continued spearheading women's rights as Michigan's first female lieutenant governor in 1982. She also served on five corporate boards, two that had been all male and she

was the only woman to serve in all three branches of government in Michigan.

In addition to her great accomplishments for women's rights, Martha was also the driving force in helping me obtain my seat on the prestigious House Judiciary Committee. Being an advocate for civil rights herself, she saw the great importance of having an African American on the very Committee that handles many important issues, including civil rights. As a freshman in the House, having Martha Griffiths as a mentor and a friend was invaluable.

Without the leadership, strength and courage of Martha Griffiths, women would not be where they are today and neither would I. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give special thanks to Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for bringing this tribute to the floor. A tribute to a woman of such stature is long overdue.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal matters in the district.

#### 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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PASCRELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENCE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, June 19.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, June 18.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, June 18 and 19.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, June 24.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 19.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BALLANCE, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 246. An act to provide that certain Bureau of Land Management land shall be held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara and the Pueblo of San Ildefonso in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Resources;

S. 500. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in the historic district of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era; to the Committee on Resources;

S. 520. An act to authorize the secretary of the Interior to convey certain facilities to the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Resources;

S. 625. An act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies in the Tualatin River Basin in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources; and

S. 635. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to update the feasibility and suitability studies of four national historic trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 18, 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:

2701. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Modifications to the Raisin Diversion Program [Docket No. FV03-989-1 FIR] received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2702. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Rock Rapids, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14843; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-28] received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2703. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Crete, NE [Docket No. FAA-2003-14927; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-33] received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2704. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Saginaw, MI [Docket No. FAA-2002-14180; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-17] received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2705. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Berrien Springs, MI [Docket No. FAA-2002-14047; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-20] received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2706. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Greenfield, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14596; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-19] received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2707. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; St. Louis, Mo [Docket No. FAA-2003-14657; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-26] received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2708. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Marshall town, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14601; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-24] received June 9, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2709. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-173-AD; Amendment 39-13129; AD 2003-08-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2710. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-386-AD; Amendment 39-13113; AD 2003-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2711. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-343-AD; Amendment 39-13108; AD 2003-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2712. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-26-AD; Amendment 39-13141; AD 2003-09-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2713. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric CF34-8C1 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-13143; AD 2003-09-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2714. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Air-

craft, Inc. Models PA-23, PA-23-160, PA-23-235, PA-23-250, and PA-E23-250 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-44-AD; Amendment 39-13142; AD 2003-09-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2715. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models C35, D35, E35, F35, G35, H35, J35, K35, M35, N35, P35, S35, V35, V35A, and V35B Airplanes [Docket No. 93-CE-37-AD; Amendment 39-13147; AD 94-20-04 R2] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2716. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-13146; AD 2003-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2717. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model 717-200 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-245-AD; Amendment 39-13153; AD 2003-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2718. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model 717-200 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-309-AD; Amendment 39-13155; AD 2003-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2719. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model Beech 400A and 400T Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-335-AD; Amendment 39-13158; AD 2003-10-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2720. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MORAVAN a.s. Model Z-242L Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-24-AD; Amendment 39-13171; AD 2003-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2721. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-10-AD; Amendment 39-13156; AD 2003-10-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2722. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, -200CB, and -200PF Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-329-AD; Amendment 39-13109; AD 2003-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2003; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

### 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. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 281. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent (Rept. 108-157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 282. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1528) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect taxpayers and ensure accountability of the Internal Revenue Service (Rept. 108-158). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 2330. A bill to sanction the ruling Burmese military junta, to strengthen Burma's democratic forces and support and recognize the National League of Democracy as the legitimate representative of the Burmese people, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-159 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2330. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, and the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than July 7, 2003.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2488. A bill to provide for the protection of the tropical forests of the Karst Region of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the aquifers and watersheds of this region that constitute a principal water source for much of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 2489. A bill to provide for the distribution of judgment funds to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COLE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JOHN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. EVANS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BELL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2490. A bill to promote elder justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. EMERSON (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JANKLOW, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2491. A bill entitled the "Greater Access to Affordable Pharmaceuticals Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMPSON:

H.R. 2492. A bill to ensure that recreation benefits are accorded the same weight as hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits and environmental restoration benefits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2493. A bill to assist local governments in conducting gun buyback programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2494. A bill to improve and promote compliance with international intellectual property obligations relating to the Republic of Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 2495. A bill to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to decrease the requisite blood quantum required for membership in the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo tribe; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 2496. A bill to authorize a national museum, including a research center and related visitor facilities, in the city of El Paso, Texas, to commemorate migration at the United States southern border; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WYNN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CASE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2497. A bill to permit commercial importation of prescription drugs from Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a prescription benefit program for all Medicare beneficiaries; 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. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 2499. A bill to provide economic relief to general aviation small business concerns that have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the terrorist attacks perpetrated against the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2500. A bill to enable the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to investigate effects of migratory birds on sustained productivity of stocks of fish of common concern in the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution extending condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones of the late Mr. Eugene Gilmer; to the Committee on Government Reform.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

98. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 172 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring the retroactive award of the Combat Medical Badge to all Vietnam personnel serving in the 91 MOS who were assigned to helicopter ambulances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

99. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1871 memorializing the United States Congress to fund the F/A-22 Raptor Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

100. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Resolution No. 40 memorializing the United States Congress that the Virginia House of Delegates urge the President of the United States to continue to take all actions necessary to protect all 50 states and their people, our allies, and our armed forces abroad from the threat of missile attack; to the Committee on Armed Services.

101. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 276 memorializing the United States Congress to take such steps as are necessary to assure that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission not adopt its proposed rules for Standard Market Design for

electricity markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

102. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation eliminating inequities created by the so-called superfund law, which pertains to the clean up of sites contaminated by hazardous waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

103. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, relative to Joint House Resolution 15 memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the federal government to thoroughly review and work to mitigate the economic impact of the recent rise in natural gas and gasoline prices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

104. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 70 memorializing the United States Congress to endorse the Western States Education Initiative to seek just compensation from the federal government on federally owned land and that it urge the federal government to provide an expedited land exchange process for land not in contention for wilderness designation; to the Committee on Resources.

105. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 101 memorializing the United States Congress that the Idaho Legislature supports and endorses the "Action Plan for Public Lands and Education"; to the Committee on Resources.

106. Also, a memorial of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Resolution No. 38 memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation in support of funding for nitrogen reduction technology; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

107. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 8 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the improvement of the prescription drug program provided to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

108. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 102 memorializing the United States Congress to work to pass and vote for the immediate and permanent repeal of the death tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

109. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 103 memorializing the United States Congress to vote to repeal the individual and corporate Alternative Minimum Tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 141: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 189: Ms. LEE and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 227: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. LANTOS.  
 H.R. 300: Mr. TOOMEY and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 303: Mr. WU, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 375: Mr. TAUZIN  
 H.R. 401: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
 H.R. 463: Mr. CANTOR.  
 H.R. 528: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 548: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 594: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. MOORE.  
 H.R. 685: Mr. McNULTY.  
 H.R. 687: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. GIBBONS.  
 H.R. 713: Mr. BOEHLERT.  
 H.R. 716: Mr. MOLLOHAN.  
 H.R. 813: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 886: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 898: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 935: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 941: Mr. DEUTSCH.  
 H.R. 953: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 979: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 1005: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 1043: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. FALCOMA of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1057: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.  
 H.R. 1068: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ROSS, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 1093: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 1112: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1155: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. KUCINICH.  
 H.R. 1157: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
 H.R. 1165: Ms. SOLIS.  
 H.R. 1167: Mr. WOLF and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 1177: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.  
 H.R. 1179: Mrs. CAPITO.  
 H.R. 1243: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 1283: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 1288: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.  
 H.R. 1296: Mr. FROST and Mr. LANTOS.  
 H.R. 1311: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. ALEXANDER.  
 H.R. 1316: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 1321: Mr. BELL.  
 H.R. 1336: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1409: Mr. CANNON.  
 H.R. 1428: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1429: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.  
 H.R. 1448: Mr. WEINER.  
 H.R. 1470: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 1472: Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. CYLBURN.  
 H.R. 1499: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 1511: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HILL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. LOWERY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H.R. 1532: Mr. STARK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. Holt, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 1552: Mr. WOLF, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 1671: Mr. LAHOOD.  
 H.R. 1675: Mr. JANKLOW.  
 H.R. 1705: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 1725: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 1746: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
 H.R. 1749: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. MOLLOHAN.  
 H.R. 1767: Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 1778: Mr. HOEKSTRA.  
 H.R. 1793: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H.R. 1824: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HALL, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. WAMP.  
 H.R. 1828: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. GINGREY.  
 H.R. 1871: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 1886: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 1914: Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 1915: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. PAUL.  
 H.R. 1916: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. EMANUEL.  
 H.R. 1926: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 1943: Mr. NEY.  
 H.R. 1981: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 2011: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 2022: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 2028: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2032: Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2046: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2057: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 2063: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 2093: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 2118: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 2120: Mr. DREIER.  
 H.R. 2166: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 2172: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 2176: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 2181: Mr. CHOCOLA.  
 H.R. 2191: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2193: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. BALLANCE.  
 H.R. 2198: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 2202: Ms. HARRIS.  
 H.R. 2232: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 2239: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 2241: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 2242: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 2246: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 2249: Mr. OXLEY.  
 H.R. 2260: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CAMP.  
 H.R. 2262: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2295: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 2299: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 2301: Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 2307: Mr. NEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 2318: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.  
 H.R. 2325: Mr. WU and Ms. BERKLEY.  
 H.R. 2330: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2347: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 2351: Mr. DEUTSCH.  
 H.R. 2357: Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GILLMOR.  
 H.R. 2377: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 2403: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 2409: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.  
 H.R. 2433: Mr. EVANS and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 2458: Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 2459: Mr. POMEROY.  
 H.R. 2462: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.  
 H.R. 2476: Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 2485: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. BALLENGER.  
 H.J. Res. 58: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. ROSS.  
 H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.  
 H. Con. Res. 78: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.  
 H. Con. Res. 87: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. POMEROY.  
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.  
 H. Con. Res. 119: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
 H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. PORTER.  
 H. Con. Res. 208: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H. Res. 141: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H. Res. 144: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 234: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MOORE.  
 H. Res. 237: Mr. CLYBURN.  
 H. Res. 240: Mr. ROSS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BELL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. FROST.  
 H. Res. 262: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H. Res. 277: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. ROHRBACHER.  
 H. Res. 278: Mr. FROST, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. NADLER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:  
 H.R. 1472: Mr. NUNES.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,  
 17. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Jacksonville, Florida, relative to Resolution 2003-501-A memorializing the Congress of the United States to unanimously co-sponsor and pass Senate Bill 766 and House Bill 197 to locate a national cemetery for veterans in Jacksonville; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.