

The proposed project is undergoing environmental review by a variety of Federal agencies but without Congressional authorization and without a coherent process to protect marine resources. A private developer is taking advantage of the lack of Federal authority and seeking to use public resources without any guaranteed benefit to the public. Given this lack of Federal policy, consistency becomes all the more critical as it is the only way states can have a voice in decision making.

Under current law, states do have a voice. The Coastal Zone Management Act stipulates that states can review projects which impact their coastal waters and appeal a project that is inconsistent with its overall interests. Currently there is no limit on the time the Secretary of Commerce can use to develop the record to make a decision in an appeals case. The oil and gas industry complains that this leads to unnecessary delay and increased projects costs. Industry proponents are using the energy bill conference to insert a provision that closes the record in 120 days and provides no grounds for any extensions.

This measure is a direct attack on consistency. And as the Nantucket project illustrates, consistency may be the only way local interests are protected. For this reason, I hope you join me today in affirming the right of states to determine their future and support the Capps/Miller motion to instruct.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Florida's white sand, clear waters and gorgeous sunsets have truly become not only a treasure for our State, but a treasure for our Nation and the millions of tourists who visit Florida's beaches every year. Today, Floridians, Californians, the people of the Great Lakes and the Eastern Seaboard are asking for your help to preserve these treasures for our children and grandchildren. Florida's beaches are again being threatened by plans to commence with an inventory of all lease sale areas, including those that are currently under moratorium until 2012.

As our colleagues will recall, the House unanimously removed language calling for an inventory of all OCS lease sale areas from the final version of the House Energy bill this past April. However, despite our clear and strong position in the House and omission of the provision in the Senate version, the OCS inventory provision has reemerged in the current draft of the conference report. I believe it is important to send a unified message that this House will not fall to the will of a few behind the scenes and we will not allow the OCS moratorium to be weakened by the inventory language in the draft of the Energy bill Conference Report. Once again, the coasts are being threatened and the House must state its will to the Conferees by voting for the Capps Motion to Instruct.

It is my hope that both the Chairman of the House Committee on Resources and the Chairman of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce will abide by their promises made on the floor during debate on the House Energy bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Capps Motion to Instruct once again to remove the inventory language from the Energy bill.

One of the stated purposes of the OCS inventory is to "lead to additional Outer Continental Shelf leasing and development." The estimated cost for the inventory exceeds \$49 billion, not to mention that a single offshore rig

emits the same quantity of air pollution as 7,000 cars driving 50 miles per day. Floridians have continually fought to keep these activities off of their shores and we are appalled by the amount of government waste attributed to these inventory activities. The inventory language is a blatant attempt to sneak these rigs into our economy and way of life.

Recently, I was joined by 100 of our colleagues in sending a letter to the House and Senate Conferees opposing the inclusion of this language. Soon afterwards, both Senators from Florida and 24 of the 25 Floridians in the House signed onto a letter to the Leadership expressing our unified opposition to this language. I hope that today you will join us in this fight and vote to instruct the conferees to withdraw this language.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. 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.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CROWLEY moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

Mr. CROWLEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to instruct be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion and insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I am offering a motion to instruct conferees on the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, while many of my colleagues continue to believe that higher deficits and more tax cuts for the rich are the way to end this Bush recession, let us look at the facts.

Since the beginning of the Bush administration, America has seen the loss of over 3.3 million jobs, of which 2.5 million have been in manufacturing. Moreover, taxes on working families have gone up. This is via interest rate increases that makes your monthly mortgage payments higher and increases your monthly car payments.

The national deficit has soared to almost half a trillion dollars this year and is increasing. And what are you getting? Your tax dollars are paying over \$300 billion this year alone on interest on the Bush tax cut for the rich.

Finally, Democrats, working with Senate Republicans, put forth a bill to give working families a real tax cut: an extension of the child tax credit. The Republicans oppose it. They are opposing a tax cut on working families.

The people missing out on this tax cut include 6.5 million working families and their 12 million children who are struggling to make ends meet. One in five of these children are from active duty military families, making even a Republican Senator from Arizona who, by the way, ran for President just 2

years ago, to say, and I quote, "I don't understand how you, the Republican leadership and the President, left enlisted men and women out of this tax package. I do not get it." End quote.

Additionally, this bill will disproportionately penalize African American and Hispanic children. Mr. Speaker, 2.4 million African American children and 4.1 million Hispanic children's families deserve this tax cut, but the Republican party refuses to give it to them, preferring tax cuts for millionaires and big business, this according to the Children's Defense Fund.

This Republican tax package ignores the needs of working families; and by ignoring 6.5 million working families, it will have a devastating impact on these families and the children across our country. It will have a particularly devastating impact on Latino and African American families, those suffering some of the worst brunt of this Bush recession.

We see 3.3 million U.S. jobs disappear in America since January of 2001. We see the unemployment rate for African Americans at 11.2 percent of the population. We see the Hispanic unemployment rate at 7.5 percent.

On top of that, this most recent tax bill for the rich cut out child care tax benefits for the poorest children in America whose parents are working, not on welfare as the Republicans would have you believe, but are working people who can barely keep their head above water, thanks to the economic nightmare cast on America by this Republican party and President Bush.

These are people struggling to provide for their families, and this Republican Congress refuses to fix it. Republicans are holding America's working families hostage by opposing any legislative remedy to help working families and instead by offering another huge tax cut for the richest 1 percent of Americans.

Again, I believe it is shameful to be offering tax cuts to the rich while cutting benefits for the working poor, cutting benefits for our veterans, cutting benefits for seniors on Medicare, and allowing millions of American jobs to disappear since President Bush and Republicans began to set economic policy almost 3 years ago.

President Bush's economic plan has failed the American people who should be some of the most cherished members of our society, our veterans, working families, and innocent children. President Bush's economic plan does more than ignore these groups. In my opinion, and many other people's opinion, it hurts them.

As the Disabled American Veterans wrote in a letter to Speaker HASTERT and the Republican Party earlier this year during consideration of the Republican budget, which mandated massive cuts in veterans' programs, Disabled American Veterans asked, "Have you no shame?" They were speaking to the Republican Party. Today I ask that

same question on behalf of the working families of my district, the Bronx and Queens.

The child tax credit bill passed by this Republican House leaves children and families in my district behind, particularly families of color. Families earning between \$10,500 a year and \$26,625 a year are excluded from claiming the child tax credit increase. What does this mean for Latino families? Half of all Latinos report having an annual household income under \$30,000. Half of all Latinos report having an annual household income under \$30,000. The House Republican child tax credit plan means most of these Latino families will be excluded, will be excluded from the child tax credit. It means that approximately 1.6 million or 30 percent of the eligible Latino families who might have otherwise benefited from the increase are being left out. This is on top of the fact that the Bush economic plan means more Latinos are out of work.

Moreover, Latinos have a faster-rising unemployment rate than the general population. As of this summer it was 7.5 percent compared to roughly 6 percent for the average American. This is on top of the fact that the Bush tax cut on dividend income affects only 7 percent of Hispanics who own stock.

Latinos in my district want to work, and they want to do what they can to provide good futures for their children. But many Latinos in my district are working in low-wage jobs or, thanks to the number of full-time jobs lost, are only working part time. They are being left out of the Bush tax credit.

President Bush's priorities are clearly not working for Latino families, and they are clearly not working for African American families either. African American families are among the hardest hit by the Bush tax plan and the House Republican child tax credit.

About 932,000 African American children under the age of 18, according to the Children's Defense Fund, live in extreme poverty. Given our economy, it is unfortunately not surprising that this statistic represents a 50 percent increase since 1999.

African American families, like Latino families are disproportionately left out of the Bush child tax credit. African American unemployment is rising to above 10 percent. Those who are eligible to find work are often barely getting by.

These are the families that need the child tax credit the most, and yet these are the families that the Republicans and this President are leaving out. A family earning \$20,000 with two children is being overlooked by President Bush in favor of the family earning \$200,000 a year who does not necessarily need the child tax credit. Yet a family earning \$20,000 is the family that sincerely needs a \$400 child tax credit. That credit would be equivalent to a 4 percent raise in pay. But that tax credit does not exist under President Bush's plan.

President Bush's priorities are not the families that need the tax credit the most. President Bush continues to ignore the voices of Latino and African American families. Our national debt increases, our debt limit increases, and President Bush continues to increase tax breaks for those who do not need them. And I believe and all of this side of the aisle believe that that is wrong.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) apparently has not read the House-passed bill. The House-passed bill is the same as the motion to instruct in the treatment of low-income families. Both accelerate the refundability of the child tax credit effective this year, exactly the same as the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY). We all agree that changes need to be made in the child tax credit. The legislation passed by the House earlier this year, legislation that passed by voice vote, by the way, makes a number of beneficial changes to the child tax credit. For example, the House legislation will ensure that child credit remain at \$1,000 per child through the year 2010. Under current law, the credit is scheduled to be reduced after 2004 resulting in a tax increase on American families. I hope we can all agree to keep the credit at \$1,000.

The House bill also eliminates the marriage penalty in the child credit. Eliminating this marriage penalty will provide more than \$20 billion of tax relief to middle-income families over 11 years.

The House bill enhances tax fairness for the members of the U.S. military who risk their lives to defend our freedom by granting capital gains relief on home sales, making death gratuity payments tax free, and other important provisions.

Perhaps of most interest to those who are supporting the motion, the House bill increases the amount of the child tax credit that is refundable from 10 percent of income over \$10,500 to 15 percent of income over this amount. Our bill would make this increase effective this year.

The motion to instruct, on the other hand, would reduce the child tax credit for millions of children. It would allow the child credit to drop from \$1,000 per child to \$700 per child.

□ 1715

The motion to instruct does not eliminate the marriage penalty in the child credit until 2010 and then it only does so for 1 year.

Under this motion to instruct, millions of children will be denied the child credit simply because their parents are married. The House bill benefits middle-income families by eliminating the marriage penalty in the child credit immediately.

Finally, let me make clear that the House passed bill does not, I repeat, does not deny the child credit to military families. Military families, including those who are deployed abroad, are already receiving a refundable child credit and will continue to receive a refundable child credit under the House bill.

The motion to instruct would use a different definition of the income when determining the child credit, thus increasing the child credit for some military families. But I would note that this definition of income is different than the definition of income recommended by the prior administration, a Democratic administration. In fact, the current definition of income, as proposed by the Clinton administration, was enacted in the law in order to simplify the program and limit the potential for fraud and abuse.

So let us be clear. The House bill provides more tax relief to military families because it includes \$806 million in military tax benefits that are not included in the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, we should support the very worthy legislation passed by this House and reject the motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that I think my colleague is euphoric over the victory yesterday of his party and the election in California. I know perfectly well what bill is before this House, what bill passed this House. I know that at that desk is a bill from the other body that is a clean bill, that will not cost any additional money above and beyond what the Senate has asked for to pay for the tax cut for the 6.5 million poor people that we are talking about that deserve and need this tax cut.

The bill that passed this House will cost an additional \$80 billion and support the wealthiest 1 percent in this country. I was very clear in my statement about that. I know what bill passed this House. I voted against that bill. I will support, and I would ask the gentleman if he will go to our leadership and bring down to this floor a bill that we can all support. The gentleman said it himself, he does not necessarily disagree with me that these 6.5 million people should get this tax credit, but he wants to pass a bill that will also tag on additional billions of dollars, increasing our national debt, an additional \$80 billion to support the wealthiest 1 percent in this country. I think that is unconscionable.

But, then again, in California we can look at the job loss rate. Since this President took office, they have lost 361,000 jobs in that State. I wonder if we ask any of the 361,000 people, who probably will not be eligible now for a child tax credit under their bill, whether they think this bill should pass or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, in thinking about the context of these bills, I imagined how we would react if a politician pulled up next to a third grader getting out of school ready to traipse home, came up to the third grader and said, I am taking your lunch money unless I get my new tax break at over \$200,000 income, and I am not giving you your lunch money for tomorrow unless I get my tax break, because that is what the Republican position is on this bill.

The Republican House position on this bill is that unless these higher-income individuals get an additional tax break on top of the millions of dollars they have already got, that little Johnny does not get his lunch money, and his parents do not get the child tax credit break that they have coming to them.

We have a bill right here that will get unanimous approval to give this child tax credit to the people who deserve it, but they will not give it to him because they are holding these children hostage. And it is not a pretty sight from either side of this aisle. And when we think about the children who are subject to this, I want to make sure we know who these kids are and who their parents are: 178,000 are children of farmers, good folk; 567,000 are children of nurses or orderlies taking care of our families; 337,000 of them are teachers; and 262,000 are children of personnel, many of whom are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

But I want to make sure the record is really clear, the Republican party is telling the Army, for example, in Iraq today that their children do not get a tax credit unless the millionaires of America get another tax break for their income. And when you come home, you will be coming home to an America where your kid still does not get a tax credit unless our millionaire buddies who participate in the political process get their tax break first.

That is not the message I want to send. That is not the message the Democratic party wants to send to the soldiers and sailors who are proudly serving in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

I also want to point out another glitch that we need to fix that the Republicans refuse to fix. Today an E-5 sergeant with 6 years of service and two children, who is paid \$29,000, who is serving in Iraq today would normally get the \$1,000 tax credit, but because they are in combat, under existing law, this is pretty incredible, because they are in combat, they only get a \$450 break under the House bill. So what the Republican House bill did is to say people who go to Iraq and get combat pay get a less child credit.

We want to fix that problem. I think probably the Republicans want to fix

that problem too, but they just refuse to do it because you want to hold it hostage to the tax breaks for their rich pals, and that is wrong. And the reason we have come down here is we are not going to give up on this until these kids and their parents get this tax credit, and we are going to make sure America knows about this travesty to get this done. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for sticking on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend is incorrect. The House bill does not give any benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent of families because the wealthiest are not eligible for the child credit. Our bill benefits low-income and middle-income families who are left out of the Democrat motion to instruct.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any additional speakers? I reserve the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is prepared to close. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) may proceed.

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this House passed a good bill to improve the child tax credit and to provide tax relief to our brave men and women in the Armed Forces.

Now is not the time to abandon what we have already done. We should continue to work with the other body to resolve this issue, but we should not settle for a bill that is inferior to what was already passed by this House. Hardworking families and the military men and women who preserve our freedom deserve tax fairness today more than ever. Let us show our support for the House bill by rejecting this motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say in response to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), under the House bill that passed that I voted against, I actually, myself, personally, would become eligible for the tax credit. I would only become eligible for it if the House bill passed. I did not ask for it. I am not asking for it. I do not need it, but I have constituents in my district who are asking me for it. They do need it.

I do not have a rich district. I do not have a wealthy district. I have a lower-to lower-middle-class district, and they are asking for this assistance.

Today I rise in support of these working families and of their children and of similar families all across this country from New York City to California, from the State of Maine to Florida and Texas. Today, I rise in support of African American and Latino families in

my district and across this Nation as well. Today I rise in support of our military families who are serving our country while trying to provide for a better life for their children.

The Republican child tax credit package hurts all of those groups. A child tax credit package that goes out of its way to exclude those that need it the most, the families that need it the most, that it is actually most meaningful to, is not helpful to these families in our country, a child tax credit package that goes out of its way to exclude those that would actually spend the tax credit, putting those funds back into our stalled economy, it just simply is not helpful to those families and to our country that needs that stimulus. That is not a family-friendly package and that package is not helpful to our economy.

Yet, my colleagues on the other side are still telling us that higher deficits and more tax cuts for the rich are the way to end this Bush recession. Republicans are still telling us that tax cuts for the rich are what will help working families. Well, the statistics tell us a different story and the people of my district, they understand there, and they know better.

Since President Bush took office, America has lost over 3.3 million jobs. That is 3.3 million people hurt by reckless tax policies of this administration and this Republican Congress. And yet the Republicans still have the audacity to tell the working African American and Latino families that they, by and large, will be excluded from yet another tax break. Mr. Bush and House Republicans have the audacity to tell many working families who serve our military that they too will be excluded. Mr. Bush has the audacity to charge those families suffering the most under an economy he created and says he will not help.

The Republicans have given us 3.3 million new unemployed in this country. The Republicans have given us a \$500 billion deficit this year. The Republicans have given us high interest rates on our homes and cars through reckless economic policies. Yet the Republicans refuse to give American working families and the enlisted military personnel a much needed tax cut. It is unconscionable, and I urge my colleagues in this House to support this motion before us.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative CROWLEY's motion to instruct the conferees to grant the Child Tax Credit to thousands of needy families wrongfully ignored by the Republican majority.

When the conference report on the Republican tax cut was finished, the dividend tax cut got bigger and tax credits for working families got smaller. It is unconscionable that we are willing to sacrifice Child Tax Credits for the poorest in our society, so that we can give more money to the wealthiest.

Six and a half million families in this Nation earn \$10,500 to \$26,625 per year. If we do not pass a child tax credit for the families, 19 million children will be ignored. In my home

State of California, nearly 1.3 million working families will not receive a child tax credit because the Republicans needed to give President Bush more billionaire tax cuts. These working families need relief!

By not passing a complete child tax credit, 250,000 kids of active duty military families, many of whom are right now fighting overseas, will be ignored. Military families need relief!

Our economy is in desperate need of stimulus. Unemployment across the Nation has remained over 6 percent and the Hispanic unemployment rate remains above 7.5 percent. America's families are suffering.

Unemployment is up. Wages are down. Poverty is on the rise. More Americans can no longer afford health care.

America's families need our help. They need a child tax credit!

During this time of economic downturn we must not leave out those who are working harder for less pay or those who have recently joined the ranks of the unemployed. It is time to put working families back into the equation.

I urge my colleagues to support Representative CROWLEY's motion to instruct.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. 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.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1 be instructed to reject division B of the House bill.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer a motion to instruct the House conferees on H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003, to strike the health savings security accounts. The \$174 billion saved should be used to provide employer subsidies in order to prevent over 4 million retirees from losing their existing drug benefits.

Many of us believe that the House Medicare bill does not go far enough in providing an affordable and adequate prescription drug benefit to the 13 million senior citizens and persons with disabilities who lack coverage. There are, however, 12 million retirees who today enjoy better coverage through employer-sponsored insurance than the benefit included in H.R. 1. I suspect that very few of us would be willing to say that those 12 million retirees should lose the better coverage they have today.

In fact, one of the selling points of this bill is supposed to be that enrollment in the Medicare benefit is purely voluntary, that retirees can keep their existing coverage if they want; but, unfortunately, this is not the case. We know that from the July 22 Congressional Budget Office analysis of H.R. 1 that one in three out of those 12 million retirees would be worse off if we pass this bill. I want to repeat that. According to the CBO, one out of three of those 12 million retirees would be worse off if we pass this Medicare bill.

It seems to me that our theme ought to be at least first do no harm; but 32 percent of retirees with employer-sponsored insurance would lose that coverage, according not just to the CBO but to studies like the one recently released by Ken Thorpe, a health policy expert now working at Emory University. He agrees with the CBO figures and has given us state-by-state figures about the impacts of H.R. 1.

According to Dr. Thorpe's analysis, 163,000 retirees in my State and in the State of the gentleman who takes the opposite view would lose their coverage and be forced to pay more for their medications if H.R. 1 passes. In every State across our great Nation, there are retirees and retiree families who would be worse off under this bill: 252,000 in Florida; 45,000 in Iowa; 218,000 in Michigan; 55,000 in Louisiana, and on and on the litany of retirees who would do worse under this Medicare bill.

The devastating impact this bill would have on these 12 million retirees and their families is probably unintended. Many of my colleagues may not have known about this problem when H.R. 1 passed this body by a single vote; but now we know about those