



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2004

No. 43

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 31, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RAY LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Cindy Baskin, Pastor, St. James Episcopal Church, Potomac, Maryland, offered the following prayer: Almighty and everliving God:

You are the source of all wisdom and understanding, the source of all justice and righteousness. By Your gracious will, You have instituted governing bodies on Earth and granted them authority to rule.

We therefore beseech You, as this legislative body gathers this day, to guide and direct these elected representatives, enable them to seek first Your honor and glory in all their deliberations. Keep them ever-mindful of their calling to serve this Nation. Guide them in the ways of righteousness, that they may enact such laws for the welfare of our country, as shall please You.

Help each one, as they struggle for justice and truth, to confront one another without hostility or bitterness. Foster among them a spirit of mutual forbearance and respect. Take away any arrogance, anger, or self-interest, which infecting human hearts creates unnecessary divisions. Break down all walls that separate and empower this House to work together through any

struggles and confusion so that Your purposes on Earth may be accomplished. Guide, we pray, each of these Representatives to perceive what is right and grant each one both the courage to pursue it and the grace to accomplish it.

We now commend this body and this Nation into Your merciful care, O Lord, that being guided by Your providence we may dwell secure in Your peace and live to Your honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, 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. 2443. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2004, to amend various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2443) "An Act to author-

ize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2004, to amend various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. WYDEN, and from the Committee on Environment and Public Works: Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. JEFFORDS; to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to title VI, section 637 of Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Helping to Enhance the Livelihood of People (HELP) Around the Globe Commission:

Michael A. Ledeen of Maryland.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Helping to Enhance the Livelihood of People (HELP) Around the Globe Commission:

Eric G. Postel of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 104(c)(1)(A) of Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program:

William E. Troutt of Tennessee.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND CINDY BASKIN

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome here today

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.

H1743

Reverend Cindy Baskin from my congressional district, and I want to thank her for delivering a beautiful prayer.

Today, March 31, is the last day of Women's History Month; and I think it is especially fitting that we end this month with a prayer from a woman guest chaplain. I also want to note that our House attending physician, Dr. John Eisold, is a member of Reverend Baskin's congregation; and I thank him for suggesting that Reverend Baskin be here this morning for our opening prayer.

Let me read what members of Reverend Baskin's congregation have said about her: "Cindy serves with strong leadership, inspired vision, and endless energy. She encourages us to use our talents in service to the community, while ministering to the congregation as pastor, priest, and friend."

I thank Reverend Baskin for inspiring us here this morning through her prayer and inspiring us to serve our Nation, our community, and reach out to others in the world. Thank you, Reverend Baskin for being here this morning and opening the House of Representatives.

DEMOCRACY DEMANDS FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND FAIR MEDIA COVERAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all citizens should be aware that President Bush really has two opponents in his reelection effort: the Democratic nominee and the national media.

Most of the national media minimize or ignore the good news for President Bush, like last week's CBS poll showing him ahead, and magnify every criticism.

That is no surprise. TV coverage of the President is mostly negative. News articles are often slanted, and three of the largest newspapers in America have not endorsed a Republican for President in 50 years.

A recent survey shows that over half of the American people believe that "media stories and reports are often inaccurate."

Voters should insist on getting objective news reports so they can make good decisions. Democracy demands not only freedom of speech but also fair media coverage.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND WORK OF CESAR E. CHAVEZ

(Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's history is filled with heroes who, through personal sacrifice and a strong commitment to their cause, have left a mark upon society.

Today, I am proud to honor the life and accomplishments of the late, tal-

ented union organizer and human rights advocate, Cesar E. Chavez.

Born on March 31, 1927, to a farming family in Yuma, Arizona, Chavez learned early that life is filled with challenges, particularly for those who work the fruit and vegetable fields of this great country.

Those fields nurtured Chavez's desire to create a farm workers union, which we know today as the UFW.

Cesar Chavez brought dignity and respect to the farm workers and became an inspiration and a resource to other people engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world. From 1965 to the 1980s, Chavez worked tirelessly to increase wages as well as public awareness of the plight of migrant workers. Chavez defended the rights of farm workers until his death on April 23, 1993.

Chavez's courage and perseverance continues to be a source of inspiration for me and many others dedicated to the interests of America's working families.

Today, Chavez would have celebrated his 77th birthday. I am proud to celebrate his life and his work. May his spirit and dedication continue to be an inspiration to those engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world.

PUNDITS WEARING POLITICAL BLINDERS

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we are in the midst of an election year. As a matter of fact, judging from the intensity of the campaign so far, one might think that we are at the end of October instead of the end of March.

Part of the reason for this intensity is the news organizations who are captivated not by the issues at hand but by the horse race, who is ahead and who is behind; and reporters and pundits are the ones calling the race. But, clearly, some of these pundits are wearing political blinders, suggesting nothing less than partisan bias.

In mid February, CBS News and The New York Times conducted a poll. That night, Dan Rather rather gleefully reported the results, that the Democratic nominee held a five-point lead over President Bush, on the CBS evening news.

The next CBS News/New York Times poll was conducted and again Dan Rather reported that the Democratic nominee had a one-point lead.

Two weeks after that, a third CBS poll showed President Bush leading the Democratic nominee by three percentage points, and what did Dan Rather report on this poll? Nothing. Not a mention.

I would say that is not quite fair and certainly not balanced.

CELEBRATING THE 87TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRANSFER OF SOVEREIGNTY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS FROM DENMARK TO U.S.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as my beloved U.S. Virgin Islands celebrates the 87th anniversary of the transfer of sovereignty from Denmark to the United States of America.

On March 31, 1917, our American journey began in earnest as we became an official part of the American family. While that journey was predated by a friendship with the United States that began during the Revolutionary War, we are told by our grandmothers that on that spring day long ago there were tears of joy and sadness as they said good-bye to the old and welcomed the new.

Today, we are proud Americans serving in all of its wars, rejoicing at its accomplishments, and working with our brothers and sisters to meet its challenges in health care, education, and social justice.

We have not forgotten, however, our shared history of over 250 years with Denmark as we welcome tourists seeking Caribbean roots, apprentice our children to learn of shared craftsmanship, and share the archival materials we have in common.

Mr. Speaker, the uniqueness of the U.S. Virgin Islands can be found in its relationship to many nations, as it has been a cultural crossroads for people the world over.

Today, on March 31, 2004, we celebrate the roots of our diversity as we celebrate yet another Transfer Day.

LIFETIME SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, only in America is a penny saved a penny taxed. Perhaps that is why we have single-digit savings rates in this country. That is just wrong.

To get America back on the road to savings, today Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming and I will introduce legislation to create lifetime savings accounts.

In a lifetime savings account, people could save up to \$5,000 a year free from tax on interest earned. Money could be spent for any reason, with no minimum holding period. One could spend this money for a new transmission, school, kids' braces, home improvements, rainy day, or any of their needs, wants, and dreams. You name it. The point is, people will not be taxed for saving.

I am honored to say that Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Bodman will join us at the press conference to share the administration's support of this new proposal. We will be working as a

team to help get America saving again, tax-free.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 590) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 590

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Chandler (to rank immediately after Mr. Marshall).

(2) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: Mr. Chandler.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWING REIMPORTATION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS MEANS LOWER PRICES FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, before the House voted on the Medicare bill, the public was told it would cost \$400 billion. Later, we found out that the administration knew all along it would cost \$550 billion.

Congress was misled by an administration that hid the numbers from the public and Members of Congress because of the perceived political benefits of the new law, saying that the end would justify the means.

But according to today's Chicago Tribune, "Instead of a political bonanza, the Medicare drug benefit is fast becoming an albatross around the administration's neck. Not a single new benefit has gone to a senior citizen, and the taxpayers got stuck with another \$150 billion bill.

Now the administration wants to talk about the benefit that comes with a discount card. With the way prescription drug costs have skyrocketed over the past several years, this discount card will not accomplish anything. It is like a sale at Nieman Marcus. They jack up the prices right before the sale.

In 2001, drug costs increased by 16.9 percent; in 2002, 18.4 percent; in 2003, a projected 19.5 percent, and going on to another 15 percent.

Instead of depending on a flawed Medicare bill, we must literally drive prices down by allowing reimportation, allowing us to get our drugs in Canada and in Europe where prices are cheaper.

MANUFACTURING JOBS

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the current status of manufacturing jobs in this country.

Last week, there was an article in the Boston Globe entitled, "What the Jobless Statistics Do Not Reveal," written by Paul E. Harrington and Andrew Sum. The article focused on the debate of when job creation will begin and why there is a huge difference in the report of job growth between two surveys, the payroll survey and the household survey.

The payroll survey is the corporate survey, which indicates a decreased loss of 620,000 jobs. However, the household survey says there is a 2.3 million increase in employment during this same period of time. Why the disparity?

Well, the household survey counts self-employed and contractors. If you are self-employed like a farmer in my district, you are not counted as being an employee under the payroll survey reports. The authors point out that the disparity is due to the fact that it has become so expensive to add new workers to payroll due to high cost of health insurance, unemployment insurance, worker compensation, payroll taxes, and it is easier and cheaper to hire and pay overtime.

If we want to stem the loss of manufacturing in the corporate sector, our legislative response is clear. We are going to have to address these issues of high cost.

□ 1015

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this House over the next 2 days is going to be debating the single most important environmental and jobs bill of the session, the reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Act. It is unfortunate that we are not going to have the opportunity to deal with a bill that is right-sized for America's needs.

The administration's own Department of Transportation has concluded that we need \$375 billion to meet America's needs over the next 6 years; yet the administration has threatened to use its first veto of any bill if we have the temerity to approve anything over \$256 billion, which will be a 10 percent cut in transportation funding over the next 6 years.

Nobody in this Chamber feels that we should be cutting our investment in the future. It is time for Members on both sides of the aisle to support the bipartisan committee leadership to at least approve the \$275 billion bill, keep the basic structure in place, and make sure that we are giving America the transportation infrastructure it needs for the future.

MEDICARE DISCOUNT DRUG CARDS

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

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, during the next 3 months, Medicare beneficiaries will begin to see real savings on the cost of their prescription drugs with the help of voluntary Medicare-approved discount drug cards.

Starting in April, Medicare beneficiaries will be notified by mail of their discount card eligibility, discount card offerings, and enrollment procedures. By June, all Medicare beneficiaries, except those who already have Medicaid drug coverage, will be able to buy a card for about \$30 and take it to their local pharmacy and receive 10 to 25 percent off of the regular cost of their drugs.

People with incomes below 135 percent of poverty who sign up for the card will be eligible for an additional \$600 of additional assistance per year to help further reduce the cost of their prescription drugs in 2004 and 2005. This low-income assistance will benefit over 12,000 Indiana Hoosiers in my district, the second district of Indiana, and almost 200,000 Hoosiers statewide.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues who voted to support the bipartisan Medicare bill and the creation of a discount drug card program that will reduce the cost of prescriptions for our seniors and provide additional relief to low-income Medicare beneficiaries.

HONORING CESAR CHAVEZ'S BIRTHDAY

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today on his birthday, we recognize the courageous leadership of Cesar Chavez, a man who inspired hope, pride, and strength and provided a voice for thousands of farm workers across California and the entire country.

My district encompasses San Jose, home to Cesar Chavez for many years. It is in San Jose that Chavez began to fulfill his dream of empowering farm workers to demand basic human rights and protections from the abuses of farm owners.

Chavez experienced employer abuses firsthand and saw it happen to thousands of farm workers from childhood through his adult years. And it was he who courageously organized his fellow workers to believe in their own dignity and power to gain equal rights, fair pay, and decent working conditions.

So on this day, I honor the memory of Cesar Chavez. I congratulate his wonderful family who still lives in San Jose. We all know that he is the symbol of inspiration to many, especially the children. May the legacy of this great leader, Cesar Chavez, live on; and may we always remember his phrase to all of us, "Si se puede."

WELCOMING BULGARIA INTO NATO

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Monday there was a historic ceremony at the White House where President George W. Bush welcomed Bulgaria, Romania, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, and Latvia into NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I am particularly pleased of Bulgaria's entry as they are rapidly rising from decades of communist totalitarianism, which I have seen firsthand since my first visit to Sofia in June 1990. Bulgaria has been one of America's most courageous allies in the war on terrorism, providing troops for the liberation campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I want to personally thank the visionary Bulgarian patriots who have worked so hard to make today possible, including Prime Minister Simeon Saxe-Coburg Gotha, President Georgi Parvanov, Ambassador Elena Poptodorova, Foreign Minister Solomon Pasi, Defense Minister Nikolai Svinarov, Speaker Ognian Gerdjikov, Deputy Chief of Mission Emil Yalnazov, Ambassador Stefan Stoyanov, and Congressional Liaison Officer Zlatin Krastev.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CESAR CHAVEZ

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to take a moment to commemorate and celebrate the life of Cesar Chavez, a life that was a life with inspiration to all of us in this country because it meant the very best for all of us.

Cesar Chavez had a vision for this country, and his legacy is a living legacy because of that vision; and the realization of that vision continues to be a work in progress and a work that we must all undertake. His vision was about inclusion, that all of us in this country deserve a place at the table and deserve to be treated with respect and with the humanity we all deserve. His vision was about fairness.

This country is about all people regardless of who they are, where they came from, what they look like, what language they speak, that we all be treated fairly and equally. And his vision was the dignity of each person, that we are all entitled, all born with a dignity and a self-respect that merits the rest of us living to that legacy.

And that is the living legacy of Cesar Chavez, and we commemorate his life today as a legacy that we must all con-

tinue to strive for and to make a reality in this country.

ADDRESSING OUR OUTDATED IMMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank President Bush for recognizing the need to address our outdated immigration laws and policies, as well as to urge Congress to make this issue a top priority.

First, let me start by making it clear that I believe America should always honor its immigration tradition and legally admit a reasonable number of new immigrants every year. But the tragic events of September 11 awakened most Americans to the fact that our immigration system is not only seriously flawed; it also poses a danger to our national security.

The SAFER Act would strengthen our borders with increased screening and tracking of aliens, enhanced enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act, expedited removal proceedings, and reduced excessive immigration.

I also support H.R. 775, the bill of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), which would end the visa lottery system.

Our Nation is out of control. Immigration policies expose us to an increased risk of another terrorist attack, something I cannot sit back and allow to happen. It is time for Congress to act now to protect America's interests.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

RECORD votes on postponed questions will be taken later in the day.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4062) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through June 4, 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4062

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

The authorization for any program, authority, or provision, including any pilot program, that was extended through April 2, 2004, by section 1 of Public Law 108-205 is further extended through June 4, 2004, under the same terms and conditions.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN FEE AUTHORIZATIONS.

Section 503(f) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697 (f)), as amended by section 2 of Public Law 108-205, is further amended by striking "May 21, 2004" and inserting "October 1, 2004".

SEC. 3. FISCAL YEAR 2004 PURCHASE AND GUARANTEE AUTHORITY UNDER TITLE III OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) FISCAL YEAR 2004 PURCHASE AND GUARANTEE AUTHORITY UNDER TITLE III OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.—For fiscal year 2004, for the programs authorized by title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681 et seq.), the Administration is authorized to make—

"(1) \$4,000,000,000 in purchases of participating securities; and

"(2) \$3,000,000,000 in guarantees of debentures."

SEC. 4. COMBINATION FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2004, subsection (a) of section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) shall be applied as if the paragraph set forth in subsection (b) were added at the end of that subsection (a).

(b) PARAGRAPH SPECIFIED.—The paragraph referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

"(31) COMBINATION FINANCING.—

"(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'combination financing' means financing comprised of a loan guaranteed under this subsection and a commercial loan; and

"(ii) the term 'commercial loan' means a loan which is part of a combination financing and no portion of which is guaranteed by the Federal Government.

"(B) APPLICABILITY.—This paragraph applies to a loan guarantee obtained by a small business concern under this subsection, if the small business concern also obtains a commercial loan.

"(C) COMMERCIAL LOAN AMOUNT.—In the case of any combination financing, the amount of the commercial loan which is part of such financing shall not exceed the gross amount of the loan guaranteed under this subsection which is part of such financing.

"(D) COMMERCIAL LOAN PROVISIONS.—The commercial loan obtained by the small business concern—

"(i) may be made by the participating lender that is providing financing under this subsection or by a different lender;

"(ii) may be secured by a senior lien; and

"(iii) may be made by a lender in the Preferred Lenders Program, if applicable.

"(E) COMMERCIAL LOAN FEE.—A one-time fee in an amount equal to 0.7 percent of the amount of the commercial loan shall be paid by the lender to the Administration if the commercial loan has a senior credit position to that of the loan guaranteed under this subsection. Paragraph (23)(B) shall apply to the fee established by this paragraph.

"(F) DEFERRED PARTICIPATION LOAN SECURITY.—A loan guaranteed under this subsection may be secured by a subordinated lien.

“(G) COMPLETION OF APPLICATION PROCESSING.—The Administrator shall complete processing of an application for combination financing under this paragraph pursuant to the program authorized by this subsection as it was operating on October 1, 2003.

“(H) BUSINESS LOAN ELIGIBILITY.—Any standards prescribed by the Administrator relating to the eligibility of small business concerns to obtain combination financing under this subsection which are in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall apply with respect to combination financings made under this paragraph. Any modifications to such standards by the Administrator after such date shall not unreasonably restrict the availability of combination financing under this paragraph relative to the availability of such financing before such modifications.”.

SEC. 5. LOAN GUARANTEE FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2004, subparagraph (A) of paragraph (23) of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(23)(A)) shall be applied as if that subparagraph consisted of the language set forth in subsection (b).

(b) LANGUAGE SPECIFIED.—The language referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

“(A) PERCENTAGE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each loan guaranteed under this subsection, the Administrator shall, in accordance with such terms and procedures as the Administrator shall establish by regulation, assess and collect an annual fee in an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the outstanding balance of the deferred participation share of the loan.

“(ii) TEMPORARY PERCENTAGE.—With respect to loans approved during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this clause and ending on September 30, 2004, the annual fee assessed and collected under clause (i) shall be equal to 0.36 percent of the outstanding balance of the deferred participation share of the loan.”.

(c) RETENTION OF CERTAIN FEES.—Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (18) of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(18)(B)) shall not be effective during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2004.

SEC. 6. EXPRESS LOAN PROVISIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term “express lender” shall mean any lender authorized by the Administrator to participate in the Express Loan Pilot Program.

(2) The term “Express Loan” shall mean any loan made pursuant to section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) in which a lender utilizes to the maximum extent practicable its own loan analyses, procedures, and documentation.

(3) The term “Express Loan Pilot Program” shall mean the program established by the Administrator prior to the date of enactment of this section under the authority granted in section 7(a)(25)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(25)(B)) with a guaranty rate not to exceed 50 percent.

(4) The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(5) The term “small business concern” has the same meaning given such term under section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)).

(b) RESTRICTION TO EXPRESS LENDER.—The authority to make an Express Loan shall be limited to those lenders deemed qualified to make such loans by the Administrator. Designation as an express lender for purposes of

making an Express Loan shall not prohibit such lender from taking any other action authorized by the Administrator for that lender pursuant to section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)).

(c) GRANDFATHERING OF EXISTING LENDERS.—Any express lender shall retain such designation unless the Administrator determines that the express lender has violated the law or regulations promulgated by the Administrator or modifies the requirements to be an express lender and the lender no longer satisfies those requirements.

(d) TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF EXPRESS LOAN PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—As of the date of enactment of this section, the maximum loan amount in the Express Loan Pilot Program shall be increased to a maximum loan amount of \$2,000,000 as set forth in section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(3)(A)).

(2) TERMINATION DATE.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) shall terminate on September 30, 2004.

(3) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to modify or alter the authority of the Administrator to continue to operate the Express Loan Pilot Program on or after October 1, 2004.

(e) OPTION TO PARTICIPATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Administrator shall take no regulatory, policy, or administrative action, without regard to whether such action requires notification pursuant to section 7(a)(24) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(24)), that has the effect of—

(1) requiring a lender to make an Express Loan pursuant to subsection (d);

(2) limiting or modifying any term or condition of deferred participation loans made under such section (other than Express Loans) unless the Administrator imposes the same limit or modification on Express Loans;

(3) transferring or re-allocating staff, staff responsibilities, resources, or funding, if the result of such transfer or re-allocation would be to increase the average loan processing, approval, or disbursement time above the averages for those functions as of October 1, 2003, for loan guarantees approved under such section by employees of the Administration or through the Preferred Lenders Program; or

(4) otherwise providing any incentive or disincentive which encourages lenders or borrowers to make or obtain loans under the Express Loan Pilot Program instead of under the general loan authority of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)).

(f) COLLECTION AND REPORTING OF DATA.—For all loans in excess of \$250,000 made pursuant to the authority set forth in subsection (d)(1), the Administrator shall, to the extent practicable, collect data on the purpose for each such loan. The Administrator shall report monthly to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on the number of such loans and their purposes.

(g) TERMINATION.—Subsections (b), (c), (e), and (f) shall not apply after September 30, 2004.

SEC. 7. FISCAL YEAR 2004 DEFERRED PARTICIPATION STANDARDS.

Deferred participation loans made during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2004, under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) shall have the same terms and conditions (including maximum gross loan amounts and collateral requirements) as were applicable to loans made under such section on October 1, 2003, except as otherwise provided in this

Act. This section shall not preclude the Administrator of the Small Business Administration from taking such action as necessary to maintain the loan program carried out under such section, subject to appropriations.

SEC. 8. TEMPORARY INCREASE IN LOAN LIMIT UNDER BUSINESS LOAN AND INVESTMENT FUND AND IN ASSOCIATED GUARANTEE FEES.

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AMOUNT PERMITTED TO BE OUTSTANDING AND COMMITTED.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2004, section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(3)(A)) shall be applied as if the first dollar figure were \$1,500,000.

(b) TEMPORARY GUARANTEE FEE ON DEFERRED PARTICIPATION SHARE OVER \$1,000,000.—With respect to loans made during the period referred to in subsection (a) to which section 7(a)(18) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(18)) applies, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall collect an additional guarantee fee equal to 0.25 percent of the amount (if any) by which the deferred participation share of the loan exceeds \$1,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bipartisan work product between the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and me and is a result of the commitment made on the House floor earlier this month to provide a fix to the problem in the main flagship guaranteed lending program of the Small Business Administration.

This legislation would not only restore the overall 7(a) program to full strength, but also expand its outreach to help more small businesses grow and create more jobs.

Earlier this year, a funding shortfall unfortunately required the SBA to temporarily suspend the program for a week, reduce the maximum loan size to \$750,000, and prohibit combination or piggyback loans.

In this compromise, the annual lender ongoing fee on 7(a) loans would increase from 0.25 percent to 0.36 percent. The lender would also pay a 0.70 percent up-front fee for combination or piggyback loans. For loans under \$150,000, the lender would no longer be allowed to retain the 0.25 percent ongoing fee. Instead, this bill, under the provisions in it, the SBA will keep that fee.

H.R. 4062 raises the 7(a) guaranteed limit from \$1 million to \$1.5 million with an additional risk premium fee of 0.25 percent imposed on the borrower over and above the 3.5 percent fee they currently pay on loan amounts over \$1 million.

Finally, H.R. 4062 allows lenders the option to make loans up to \$2 million under the SBA Express program, which has a 50 percent guarantee rate; but banks can use their own paperwork. Currently lenders can only make loans up to \$250,000 under the SBA Express program. I want to make it clear, however, that I intend that this provision must be truly optional on the part of the lenders. The SBA should not do anything in its internal policies or procedures that tilts this rule in favor of SBA Express at the expense of the rest of the 7(a) lending program.

All together, these provisions will provide an additional \$3 billion in lending to small businesses for the rest of fiscal year 2004 to reach a total of 7(a) program level of \$12.55 billion without requiring any additional appropriations or reprogramming funds from other key areas within the SBA.

When this bill is passed by Congress and signed into law, SBA assures me it will provide enough lending authority for the SBA to remove the current loan cap of \$750,000 and also allow combination or piggyback loans.

By increasing the 7(a) programs lending authority, SBA estimates that through their lending partners they will be able to offer 30,000 additional guaranteed loans, which could create or retain as many as a half million jobs by the end of September.

In addition to fixing the 7(a) program, the bill authorizes the SBA to charge fees under the 504 Certified Development Company program and the Small Business Investment Company program until the end of the fiscal year or September 30, 2004. Both these programs operate solely on the basis of user fees and do not require an annual appropriation. Currently, the authority to charge these fees expires on May 21.

Finally, the general extension of SBA programs not covered by an appropriation such as the surety bond program, SBA's cosponsorship authority, and several very small procurement assistance programs, will move from the current deadline of April 2 to June 4 of 2004.

This bipartisan bill has the support of both the minority and majority sides of the Committee on Small Business. It has the support of the administration. And finally, it represents the consensus position of those who use the 7(a) program, both borrowers and lenders.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4062.

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

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

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the chairman and the House leadership for their commitment and willingness to resolve this program in a bipartisan manner.

In today's jobless recovery, small businesses are more important than ever. That is because small businesses are this country's main economic driver. They are this country's main job creator, and they are this country's number one employer. They are the backbone of the American economy.

One big challenge for small businesses is access to capital. Studies have shown that too many entrepreneurs finance their great ideas with credit cards. And this puts them into debt even before they get their businesses off the ground.

□ 1030

That is exactly why the SBA loan programs are so critical. These programs fill a financing gap for small firms, making loans on great ideas that may not have been looked at twice or invested in it at all. In fact, last year, the SBA's 7(a) flagship loan program provided hundreds of thousands of small businesses with billions of dollars that was then pumped back into the U.S. economy.

Yet, for all the good the 7(a) program has done, it recently fell on tough times. The program was shut down at the end of last year and was later reopened but with severe restrictions in place. Just after the program hit these bad times, so did the small business owners that were trying to secure loans. Suddenly, their plans to hire employees, expand their operations or purchase new equipment were put on hold; and, as a result, job creation was put on hold for the American economy overall.

I am happy to say to all those small business owners out there who have suffered, we are going to make the 7(a) loan program whole again with the bill before us today. This program that has helped countless entrepreneurs turn their dreams of business ownership into reality is back, and hopefully it is here to stay.

In H.R. 4062, we ask lenders to shoulder greater responsibility for the program, but we are also giving them a new tool by raising the guarantee rate from \$1 million to \$1.5 million. In doing this, lenders will be able to guarantee more loans, more money will flow into the American economy, and small firms will be able to create more jobs.

This fix will support our small businesses that create good-paying jobs right here in the United States, unlike the large multinational corporations that move jobs overseas in search of cheap labor and lax environmental standards without even thinking twice.

Our solution will especially help small manufacturers who have been hard hit, like Elliot Moses, a small businessman from Sandy, Utah, who was left on the edge of financial ruin when the 7(a) program was closed. Now

he and thousands of other manufacturers can get the loans they need to stay competitive, strengthen their operations here in the U.S. and hire more American workers.

With H.R. 4062, we pave the way to success for manufacturers and small businesses everywhere. With this bill, we make sure small businesses have access to capital. With this bill, we make sure small businesses can invest in their ventures, purchase new equipment, expand and create jobs. With this bill, we will be giving our economy the shot in the arm that it needs right now; and with this bill, we also give new hope to the 8.2 million unemployed Americans that something is being done to transform the current jobless environment into one of work and prosperity.

If my colleagues support our Nation's economy, if they support job creation, then I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4062.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I would ask the gentlewoman if she has any further speakers.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any other speakers.

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

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

By passing this bill, we will show small businesses just how important they are to the U.S. economy. We will show them that we want to make it easier for them to invest capital back into the businesses where it belongs; and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank all the staff who worked hard on this solution.

I would like to thank from the administration, the staff, Jenny Mayne, Anthony Bedell and Charles Rowe. From the House leadership, I would like to thank KiKi Kless and Julie Sullivan. From the chairman's office, Barry Pineles, Matthew Szymanski and Phil Eskeland. From the Democratic Committee on Small Business staff, I would like to thank the staff director Michael Day, Adam Minehardt and Jordan Haas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership. They have fought long and hard to make sure that they heard the cry of small businesses.

Small businesses have been crying throughout this country, saying that they needed the 7(a) loan programs so that they can do business; and we all recognize that small businesses are the engine that creates the jobs in this country. So to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ranking

Member VELÁZQUEZ), I thank them so much for bringing this to the floor and all of the staff members who have worked so hard.

Mr. Speaker, this critical measure will help reopen the Small Business Administration's core lending vehicle which is the 7(a) loan program, and it will provide funding for the agency through June 4. While we grapple with the budget, we recognize that there are shortcomings in terms of it, but at least it will begin to address those applications that have come to us from those small businesses that critically need the financing through the 7(a) loan program.

This bill also makes a number of important changes to the program, including lifting the \$750,000 cap on loans and gets the program running at an adequate level. It removes the regulatory restriction, also known as the "piggybacking," on SBA loans being part of larger financing packages.

This bill also creates a new financing tool by increasing the size of the loan guarantee to \$1.5 million, which provides more options for lenders providing these loans.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the 504 loan program and the SBIC program through the end of this year.

We cannot thank the ranking member and the chair enough for the hard work that they have done, because these are important loan programs for small businesses.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports, I have long understood the critical role this program plays in keeping our Nation's economy vibrant and strong. These loans are the only source of affordable, long-term financing for many of our Nation's small businesses, and loans spur economic development in underserved areas.

In addition, the 7(a) loan program can be used for long-term working capital, including accounts payable, just allowing small businesses to do business.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to pass this very important piece of legislation, H.R. 4062.

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

I urge the adoption of H.R. 4062 and call on the Senate to act quickly on this measure so that small businesses across the country can benefit.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of American small businesses and the 7(a) loan program.

President Bush has stood by while a record 2.9 million private sector jobs disappeared. The overall unemployment rate has stalled at 5.6 percent. It would be even higher if it included 1.7 million Americans who are no longer searching for employment.

As a former small business owner, I know the benefits they provide to our economy. Small businesses generate three-fourths of all new jobs. They represent 99 percent of all employers and create more than half of our

GDP. If we want our economy to grow, we need to support small businesses.

But that's not what the Administration has done. At every step they have cut programs and decreased funds. The Administration's FY2005 budget devastates small businesses. 22 programs will be terminated and 14 will see their budgets cut.

The microloan program, which provides small businesses with loans of up to \$35,000, will be terminated, while the Manufacturing Extension Program, which helps small manufacturers solve business problems, has been cut by \$66 million over the last two years. The 7(a) loan program has been repeatedly cut and dismantled. They've done everything they could think of in order to kill it. They reorganized it. They closed it down. They capped the loans.

If the 7(a) program is shut down or the amount of loans is capped, then small businesses will suffer. They will not have access to affordable capital. And they will be forced to lay off workers and shut their doors. It is so important for small business to have affordable access to capital. That is why I commend the Democrats on the Small Business Committee for working so hard to save the 7(a) loan program.

But the Administration still doesn't get it. They continually cut the programs and the funds that support our small businesses. To stop our Nation's march towards a jobless recovery, our small businesses must be taken care of. Unless the Administration recognizes the problems that face American small businesses, the unemployment rate will rise and our economy will not recover.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4062, which would temporarily extend the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program. One of the SBA's most successful initiatives, the 7(A) loan program provides loan guarantees to small businesses. These small businesses are able to use this financial assistance to start up new enterprises. In January 2004, due to lack of funding, the SBA was forced to temporarily suspend the 7(a) loan program, thus cutting off a major funding resource for thousands of potential new small businesses. While the SBA was able to have the program up and running again in a relatively short time, it was still forced to scale back on the size and scope of the 7(a) program.

I am pleased that the legislation before us today not only extends the 7(a) program, but also restores the robust nature of the program by reinstating the maximum loan amount to \$2 million. Additionally, H.R. 4062 would allow for piggyback loans, allowing businesses to seek out additional financial assistance to help grow their business. Equally important for our Nation's lenders, H.R. 4062, would increase the loan guarantee to \$1.5 million. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, plans put forth this morning will create at least \$12.5 billion in lending authority for the SBA in Fiscal Year 2004 and will allow for SBA to add an additional 30,000 loans which in turn could create thousands of new jobs.

In conclusion, I want to extend my thanks to our Chairman DON MANZULLO and Ranking Member NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ for their hard work and leadership on this issue. Today's action will allow the SBA to continue providing financial assistance to our Nation's small businesses and keep our economy growing. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4062, which will temporarily resolve the funding shortage for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) Loan Guarantee Program and ease the resulting financial burden that has been placed on small businesses. H.R. 4062 is the product of bipartisan collaboration, and I commend Chairman MANZULLO and Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ for working together to create a sound public policy response to this crisis for small businesses. I also thank the House Leadership on both sides of the aisle for responding promptly and positively.

The 7(a) Loan Guarantee Program is the Small Business Administration's flagship financing program, which accounts for 30 percent of all small business long-term loans in this country.

On February 11th of this year, the Small Business Committee held a hearing on the Administration's proposed Fiscal Year 2005 Budget for the Small Business Administration. At that hearing, small business owners from a diverse array of geographical areas and engaged in a variety of different industries testified that the financial crisis at the SBA 7(a) Loan Guarantee Program caused them undue hardship. Most indicated that the failure to access 7(a) Loans on more reasonable terms would preclude their respective companies from gaining access to the capital necessary to ensure survival. In the case of one small business owner who testified about his company's proposed project, the mayor of the city in which the company's site would be built accompanied him to Washington. The mayor spelled out exactly what was at stake for his economically distressed community; the opportunity to revive the local economy and provide new jobs, or the prospect of further decay and desperation.

H.R. 4062 lifts temporary caps on 7(a) loans that were instituted in order to respond to its financial crisis. It will again allow for 7(a) loans to be included in larger financial packages, and provide working capital for export activities of small businesses. This is a step in the right direction, and I hope that Congress will follow the model of H.R. 4062 in addressing the long-term health of a 7(a) program that is so important to small businesses, which are incubators of economic and job growth in our communities.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4062.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4062, and I am pleased that this legislation reopens the 7(a) loan program and ensures that small businesses will once again be able to benefit from its lending power.

As a former small business owner, I understand the frustrations and worries small business owners have had as this program has sat in limbo. Small businesses are one of our Nation's leading employment opportunities, but few businesses can afford to start up or expand without the help of loans.

Renewing our commitment to the Small Business Administration 7(a) loan program will not only bolster our Nation's workforce but also the economy as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleagues on the Small Business Committee for their bipartisan effort, which allowed this bill to be voted

on just in the nick of time. I would like to especially congratulate Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ, who has worked tirelessly to bring about this victory for small business.

H.R. 4062 restores the 7(a) program to its former strength by lifting the caps on 7(a) loans. It also takes the important step of removing regulatory limitations that had prevented SBA loans from being a part of larger financing packages.

7(a) loans account for nearly 30 percent of all long-term loans for small businesses in America, businesses that are the number one job creators in this country. So it is essential that we get this program back up and running again. This bill would do that, and it would also extend the important 504 loan program and SBIC programs through the end of this year.

The next step is to make sure that these authorized programs in SBA are fully funded. The President's budget provided zero funding for 7(a) and a number of other important SBA programs. Furthermore, it is important that we put safeguards in place to prevent last-minute shutdowns like those we experienced this past January.

I am working with my colleagues to restore 7(a) funds and to ensure that in the future there are not caps or program shutdowns that deny small businesses access to critically needed resources.

This is the vital next step to the authorization we are passing today, and I urge my colleagues to make certain that we provide the resources to make good on the commitment this bill makes to small businesses.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4062.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING RULES OF COMPENSATION FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 585 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 585

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 581) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding rates of compensation for civilian employees and members of the uniformed services of the United States. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the

Committee on Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. 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, H. Res. 585 is a closed rule that provides for the consideration of H. Res. 581, expressing the sense of the House regarding rates of compensation for civilian employees and members of the uniformed services of the United States.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform. The rule also provides one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to H. Res. 581, the underlying resolution, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, who has spent significant time working on this important issue for this Nation's Federal civilian employees and military personnel.

The Committee on Government Reform has held several hearings on the state of the Federal workforce. At the conclusion of those hearings, it determined that some managers may not be able to attract or retain skilled employees to the Federal workforce due to a pay gap between Federal civilian employees and their private sector counterparts.

The concept of pay parity is based on two factors: first, an acknowledgment that the pay for civilian Federal employees and military personnel has not kept pace with the private sector; and, second, a belief that there is a need to reduce the disparity in pay between civilian Federal employees and military personnel.

The pay parity issue was not addressed in the House-passed fiscal year 2005 budget resolution. Therefore, H. Res. 581 offers every Member of the House the opportunity to express their opinion on whether or not they believe that pay for civilian Federal employees should be adjusted at the same time and in the same proportion as pay for the members of the uniformed services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we may proceed to debate H. Res. 581.

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, I rise today in support of the Military and Civilian Employees Pay Parity Resolution and the rule providing for its consideration. This

underlying resolution is imperative for it expresses the sense of Congress that the government should provide fair compensation for Federal employees in order to encourage citizens to pursue a life of public service.

Federal employees consistently demonstrate the best that our government has to offer, and their contributions directly improve the lives of all Americans.

When we speak of Federal employees, we speak not only of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces but also of the men and women of literally hundreds of agencies dealing with thousands of issues. With nearly 1 million employees, the Federal Government is the largest employer in the United States. Thirty-two thousand Federal employees live in and/or around my south Florida district alone.

Employees of the Central Intelligence Agency work in oftentimes arduous conditions to safeguard our country from those who mean to do us harm.

Federal Emergency Management Agency employees provide disaster relief assistance, supplying shelter, food and funds to victims of natural disasters.

Customs agents and Transportation Security Administration officials protect our borders and our skies, and firefighters and other Federal law enforcement personnel across the Nation are our first responders to a range of hazards that can affect entire cities or single homes.

These are just a few of those Federal employees, including the fine people that do the work here transcribing our words, the clerks that work with us, the Capitol Police, the security guards, all are Federal employees; and, in my judgment, many of them do not receive fair compensation for their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, much of the world comes to know the face of America from the dedicated Federal employees living in this country and working abroad.

□ 1045

All of these hard-working employees deserve the unequivocal support of this body. Even more, they deserve just and fair compensation that competes with the private sector and rises to meet the living standards enjoyed by many Americans.

Increases in the pay of military and Federal civilian employees have not kept pace with the overall pay levels of private sector employees. There currently exists a gap of 32 percent between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and those of private sector workers and an estimated 5.7 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and those of private sector workers. This glaring discrepancy greatly hampers the ability to recruit and retain quality employees.

To run efficiently and effectively, and to provide necessary services to

the American people, the Federal Government needs to attract skilled, educated, and motivated people. We must provide Federal employees with an appropriate level of salary and benefits to encourage people to pursue a career of Federal service, whether civilian or military. Potential Federal employees must be made to understand that choosing a career of public service is not akin to taking a vow of poverty. The contributions one can make within the Federal service are lasting, desirable, and beneficial to the entire country.

I stand with my Democratic colleagues today as we point out that instead of debating a resolution expressing the sense of Congress, we should be debating a bill that actually establishes just compensation as public policy. It is shameful that while the administration and this body insist on providing a \$1 trillion tax cut for the wealthiest among us, the Republican-passed budget leaves Federal employees to cope with rising health care and education costs without adequate compensation for their jobs.

This body's failure to ensure just compensation is yet another sad example of enriching the wealthy at the expense of middle-class America. I look forward to a day when this Congress will act to provide an equitable living standard for the middle class instead of just simply raising the idea.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by again expressing my support for this legislation and encouraging my colleagues to support it. As the old saying goes, though, talk is cheap. It is now time for this body to put its money where our mouths are and include real pay parity in the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I do have additional comments that are unrelated to the parity issue. Because I do serve with my colleague on the Committee on Rules, I also feel the need to make a comment on recent issues which have taken place in the Committee on Rules.

We are experiencing a greater and greater breakdown of comity within the Committee on Rules that has me very troubled. The minority no longer receives timely notice of when the majority intends to make announcements. We no longer receive materials or even a notice that materials are available on a timely basis.

We did not, for example, receive notice from the majority that the chairman of the Committee on Rules was going to make a unanimous consent agreement last night on transportation. Although we knew from our leadership that this was going to take place, it is only a common courtesy between the majority and the minority of a committee that the minority be notified before the chairman makes announcements on the floor. Similarly, the manager's amendment for the transportation bill was apparently made available to the majority last night, but Democrats received it this morning.

I raise these issues here, Mr. Speaker, not in derogation of the issue before us, but because this is just the tip of the iceberg. No one in the minority disputes that the majority of the committee, in conjunction with the Republican leadership, controls what happens here on the House floor. But there are rules for each committee, rules which the majority is supposed to follow. And the frequency with which the majority on the Committee on Rules has taken to violating those rules and practices is increasing; and it needs to stop, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 585, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 581) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding rates of compensation for civilian employees and members of the uniformed services of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 581 is as follows:

H. RES. 581

Whereas civilian employees and members of the uniformed services of the United States provide critical services and protection for our citizens and taxpayers, and make many other significant contributions to the general welfare of the Nation;

Whereas the ability of the Federal Government to provide a competitive salary plays a critical role in its ability to recruit and retain individuals possessing the skills necessary to provide government services effectively and efficiently to the American people;

Whereas the current pay system hampers the ability of the Federal Government to achieve the goals referred to in the preceding clause;

Whereas the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990, commonly referred to as "FEPCA", sought to achieve comparability between Federal and non-Federal pay rates through annual pay adjustments based on changes in private-sector wages and salaries;

Whereas increases in the pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall pay levels of workers in the private sector, so that there currently exists an estimated 32 percent gap between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and those of private sector workers, and an estimated 5.7 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and those of private sector workers; and

Whereas, in almost every year during the past two decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members

of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) compensation for civilian employees and members of the uniformed services of the United States must be sufficient to support our critical efforts to recruit, retain, and reward quality people in Government service; and

(2) to help achieve this objective, in fiscal year 2005, compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 585, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to control 20 minutes, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) would control 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) would control 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the unanimous consent request is agreed to.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the issue today is of the utmost importance to our Federal employees, the Federal Government, and the American taxpayer. The Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act, FEPCA, of 1990, Public Law 101-509, sought to help achieve comparability through annual pay adjustments based upon the change in private sector wages and salaries. Despite our efforts, the Bureau of Labor Statistics currently estimates a 32 percent pay gap and a 10 percent gap between the military and the private sector.

In order to deliver what was promised, the Federal Salary Council recommends a 25 percent locality pay for 2005. There is clearly much work to do to fulfill the intent of Congress, and the resolution here before us is a step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), my colleague and coauthor of this resolution, along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and myself.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members to think about the following thing: the first person that was killed in Afghanistan fighting the war on terror was a constituent of mine, a CIA agent in Afghanistan. The FBI agents who are working in Afghanistan and Iraq are living under the same conditions.

The first person that everyone in this body would call if they were to find out that a loved one had been kidnapped sometime today would be the FBI. We would call an FBI agent.

The NIH cancer researchers and people doing research on juvenile diabetes and other important diseases would be affected by this resolution. Those that are guarding our borders under very difficult conditions along the northern border and the southern border would be helped and impacted by this resolution.

We hear a lot of people talking about how bad drugs are and we want to do everything we can to keep drugs from coming into our country. The DEA agents, some of whom have been killed in the line of duty, who are working full time to keep drugs out of our schools, are Federal employees and would be affected and impacted by this resolution.

The people in the fire service, that this summer as we are listening and hearing about forest fires taking place around the country, are all Federal employees who would be impacted by this resolution.

The nurses and the doctors that are working in VA hospitals that are taking care of our veterans are all Federal employees who would be impacted by this resolution.

Lastly, the Secret Service agents that are guarding the President. Secret Service Agent Timothy McCarthy, who stopped the bullet that would have killed the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, was a Federal employee.

The resolution is very, very important. I commend the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle and ask Members for an "aye" vote to send the message to the CIA, to the FBI, to the NIH and the border control, to DEA agents, to the Forest Service, the Park Service, to VA nurses, the Secret Service agents, and Social Security and other people who are working very, very hard that this is an important issue. I strongly urge Members to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 581. For the last 3 years, we have been hearing the right things being said about Federal employees coming from the White House but doing just the opposite. In the July 10, 2002, speech we heard the administration say, and I quote, "The important thing for the American people is to know that our public servants are working longer hours and working harder and working smarter to defend the American people." The White

House went on to say that "public service in America today is not just another job, it is an important act of citizenship. It is a way to fulfill our obligation to those who have gone before us and those who will follow after us, those who have sacrificed and died for us."

That is all correct. One thing that we all know is that public service is not just another job. But unfortunately, those who will follow, unless we make some changes, will have less pay, less due process and appeal rights, and no right to collectively bargain. Indeed, there will be no civil service because jobs will be contracted out. Is that the way we want to say thanks to our Federal employees for working longer hours and working harder?

Then if that is the case, we certainly would not be doing our employees any favor. There are plenty of accolades and platitudes for the civilian Federal employees who perished or were severely injured in the 9-11 attacks, but now we hear that Federal employees are a lesser priority than military employees. How many Federal civilian workers have died beside their military counterparts in Afghanistan or Iraq? What about the Federal civilian workers who died in the Murrah Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City? Can we tell their families that they are a lesser priority? How quickly we forget.

Mr. Speaker, I have not forgotten the arguments this administration and some of my colleagues used to justify rolling back Federal employees' collective bargaining rights. At that time, Federal employees were critical to homeland security at the Transportation Security Agency, at the Department of Defense, and at the Department of Homeland Security. Now we hear that there is a significant difference in the demands we place upon those in the Armed Forces and those in the civilian workforce.

Historically, Congress has expressed strong bipartisan support for parity in pay between our military and Federal civilian sectors in recognition of their important roles in our Nation's defense and general service to the American people. So I join with those who say, Stop the rhetoric and platitudes. It is time that we put our money where our mouths are. We have to stop this attack, this misuse and abuse of civilian Federal employees, and grant them equal status and equal pay.

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

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. Certainly everybody always wants to be better paid. I do not know anybody that is an exception to that particular rule. So there is always tension between what people would like to be paid and what an employer can afford to be able to pay. The em-

ployer in this case is the taxpayers of the United States of America.

This is not necessary to give what this resolution proposes, that would be supersized raises, jumbo COLAs, to the Federal workforce. We have been very generous with the Federal workforce. In the last 7 years, for every \$1 increase in the cost of living index, or for that matter in the cost of living adjustments to Social Security, for every \$1 that the cost of living has gone up, Federal workers have gotten a raise of \$1.66. They have gotten raises two-thirds higher than the actual inflation rate. In fact, in the past 4 years, Federal workers have gotten raises at twice the rate of inflation.

The President's budget proposes that the across-the-board raise for the Federal civil service should be 1.5 percent, consistent with the actual cost-of-living adjustment. This resolution, however, says that they should get 3.5 percent.

Why? Well, they say it is because we are going to give the military a larger raise and therefore we have to give the Federal civil service a larger raise, too. I do not think that is accurate. People that work at civil service jobs are not taking the same risks on behalf of their country as people that are working in our Armed Forces. We do not have the retention problems in the civil service sector as we do in the Armed Forces.

There is a letter that has been submitted by the administration, by the Office of Management and Budget, opposing this resolution and points out that we are almost at a record low on the turnover in the Federal civil service. About 1.5 percent a year, that is the whole turnover of people in Federal civil service jobs.

This is not a matter of retaining people. This is a matter of giving extra raises to people that, frankly, the taxpayers do not have the money to afford. This would cost us \$2.2 billion this year and a similar amount next year and the year after and in perpetuity to give these extra large raises rather than holding the line as we should.

For State workers, the average pay raises in the last 4 years have been only about a third of what the pay raises have been for the Federal workers. The private sector is significantly behind what we have already done for Federal workers. This is not the time when we have record deficits to be giving more than a cost-of-living adjustment to the Federal civil service.

Mr. Speaker, we have been overly generous. It is not needed to retain people; and, frankly, the taxpayers are the ones that are being asked to foot this multi-billion dollars of expenses. This is the taxpayers' money. We are being fair. We should stay that way.

The supposed pay gap, people say Federal workers are 32 percent underpaid. Actually, that particular survey does not calculate all the factors. It does not calculate the locality pay that boosts Federal civil service workers,

which cuts that gap in half; and it does not cover the benefits they receive under which that gap evaporates.

We are being fair, and we should oppose this resolution on behalf of the taxpayers of the United States of America.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think the gentleman is aware that the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act calls on the Federal Salary Council every year to make recommendations in terms of what the Federal employees would make. We could put a chart up here that would show that every year we have failed to come close to what the Federal Salary Council has recommended under the existing law of the land which is FEPCA, the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act. This year, they have recommended a 25.73 locality rate for 2005.

Congress has a long history on this issue. This resolution merely reiterates the sense of the House. Annual pay adjustments for civil employees and military members provided through the appropriations process have been identical in nearly every year over the last two decades. In addition, language to this end was included in the budget resolution for fiscal years 2002, 2003 and 2004.

In 1999, the last time the Senate held a freestanding vote on this issue, the Senate voted 94-6 in favor of an amendment expressing the same sense of Congress that we do here today.

I used to work for a billion-dollar company out in Fairfax, Virginia. Our greatest asset was not our building. It was not our computers. It was not the land. It was our employees. They walked out the door every night, and we did what we had to do to make sure they came back the next day. In an information age, people are the number one asset of any organization.

The same is true with the Federal Government. We are in danger of losing in the procurement force over 60 percent of our qualified workers over the next 5 years. These are people that can walk across the street to the private sector and make more money than they are making for the Federal Government and leave with their full retirement. These kind of minor incentives in a 3.5 percent pay raise that I do not think anybody except maybe the gentleman opposing this resolution would call a gargantuan pay raise or a huge pay raise, this is in line with what we are seeing in many cases in the private sector and in State and local governments and in my own counties that I represent in Congress.

We have to be able to recruit and retain the best and the brightest to fulfill the policies that this Congress passes and sends on. To do that, pay comparability is important, and we continue to lag significantly in that re-

spect. The Federal Government may never be able to compete with the private sector dollar for dollar, but we have to ensure that we do not fall further behind in the war for talent.

While wages are not the only factor in our recruitment and retention efforts, what employer can hope to succeed in a labor market where it is offering salaries so far below the average? This is not a cost-of-living allowance as some have argued, saying it is too generous. The purpose is to assist the Federal Government in providing salaries comparable to those in the private sector. This is achieved through annual pay adjustments based on the change in private sector wages and salaries, not the cost of living. That is the fundamental precept behind the Federal Pay Comparability Act. This is achieved through our annual pay adjustments.

The fact remains that Federal pay is not competitive. It is also important to note that providing a higher annual adjustment would not result in any budgetary increase. As they have over the last two decades, agencies pay for all their salaries, including these annual adjustments, with discretionary funds from their salaries and expense accounts. This does not score under CBO.

I think we can all agree that both armed services and the Federal civilian workforce are integral to fulfilling the role of government in America and both must be compensated accordingly. In the coming fiscal year, parity and pay adjustments remain the vehicle to help achieve comparability between the public and the private sectors on the issue of pay so that the government can continue to perform. This resolution is integral to this effort. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, number one, I was the sponsor of the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act back in 1990. We included it in the Treasury-Postal bill. It was signed by President George Bush. It was signed on the theory that we needed to pay Federal workers comparable wages to their private sector counterparts. In other words, if you are a scientist at NIH or if you are an FBI agent or if you are a CIA agent or you are a defense analyst, a civilian in the Defense Department, you would get paid comparably what your training and responsibilities required in the private sector. That was the whole theory. It was passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. In fact, it is the law today.

My friend from Oklahoma has always opposed this adjustment. Always. This is not a new posture for my friend from Oklahoma. He simply does not believe in the comparability act and does not

believe in compensating Federal employees fairly.

He talks about ECI. I wish my friend from Oklahoma would listen to these figures because I think he will find them interesting because he misrepresents what the facts are. I know he would be very interested.

Using 1969 as a base year of Federal service pay, average annual wage adjustments and CPI, which are all different figures, we specifically used wages because that is what we are competing with, not CPI. We are competing with wages in the Federal sector. Listen to this and I think you will be shocked.

Since 1969, if you take wages as the base, they are now at 614 percent. If you take CPI, it is at 509 percent over those 44 years. If you take civil service wages, they are 371.8. So they are still about 100 points behind the CPI adjustment, and they are 180 points behind what private sector wages have been adjusted. That is what this is about.

The Federal Salary Council under the law makes findings. They are in the Department of Labor. They make findings. Let me read their findings of this past year:

Based on calculations provided by the Office of Personnel Management, taking a weighted average of two sets of pay gaps, et cetera, the overall gap between base general schedule average salaries locality and non-Federal average salaries surveyed by BLS, the difference between private sector salaries and public sector salaries was 31.8 percent. In other words, for comparable responsibilities, Federal employees were making 31 percent less than their private sector counterparts.

The law said back in 1990 we get to 95 percent of private sector, saying that we are not going to put Federal employees on a par per se with the private sector but the objective is to get to 95 percent of what the private sector makes. We are not there.

The Federal council goes on to say that the overall average pay gap in 2003, including a current average locality rate of 12.12 percent, which of course we do not do, is 17.57 percent. This is the Federal pay council, out of OPM. Therefore, we recommend an overall average locality rate adjustment of 25.54 percent. That is in addition to the ECI.

Let us say the ECI was 1.5 percent which it is not, of course. It is higher than that, substantially, almost twice as much as that. But if we did that, then we would be talking about a 27 percent adjustment in Federal pay pursuant to the law which we have voted for, which the President signed.

The gentleman is shaking his head. He is inaccurate in shaking his head.

I will tell the gentleman further, to show him that he is inaccurate, the President of the United States last year came down and said in his recommendation 2 percent. The Congress gave 4.1 percent. Bush claimed last August he was saving taxpayers \$13 billion, not from the 4.1 percent but from

the 25 percent. In other words, the President of the United States adopted the premise that the law, in fact, said that the adjustment ought to be \$13 billion additional to what the President recommended.

We are not standing here arguing for that proposition, but we are standing here for the proposition, as this Congress has done 17 out of the last 19 years, saying, look, we know we can't get there, but let us not send a message to those civilian employees arrayed in Afghanistan, civilian employees arrayed in Iraq, civilian employees arrayed in Colombia, at risk, NIH researchers, critically important to the health of this Nation, people working at NASA, let us not send them a message that they are second-rate citizens. Let us pay them comparably with what we want to adjust the military. I am for that.

So I ask my friends, follow the law. But you do not have to follow all of the law, because if you followed all of the law we would break the bank. What we have said we are going to do is get to comparability. What we want to do in this resolution is to at least get to fairness. Support the Davis-Wolf-Hoyer resolution.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the gentleman from Maryland's characterization of Federal civilian employees as second-rate citizens.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not characterizing me as having said that.

Mr. BUYER. I have the time. Do I have the time?

Mr. HOYER. Personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Indiana has the time.

Mr. HOYER. I ask for personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of personal privilege is not in order.

The gentleman from Indiana has the time. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BUYER. No, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has the time and may proceed.

□ 1115

I do not agree with the characterization of Federal civilian employees as second-rate citizens. This should not be an argument about similarities without a difference between the military and the civilian. I just want the gentleman to know I disagree with that.

Today, hundreds of thousands in our Nation proudly serve us around the world in the name of freedom. Unfortunately, some in this body insist that we should not give these uniformed service personnel a raise unless we give

the same raises to everyone else in the Federal Government. I disagree because I know that there is a significant difference in the demands that we place upon those in the Armed Forces and those within the regular Federal workforce.

The pay increases for civilian Federal employees and members of the uniformed services should not be designed primarily to address the "spending power" or the "standard-of-living" issues that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) had just previously raised. Instead, the amount of such pay increase should be sufficient to support our critical efforts to recruit, retain, and reward quality people effectively and responsibly both in the civilian workforce and the uniformed military services.

Our civilian and military forces work under very different circumstances, and their personnel systems reflect that fact. The military is an up-or-out system, which forces members to exit the force if they are not promoted, whereas the Federal workers can remain at a particular grade level indefinitely.

The matching of military pay and rank and the general schedule grades are for protocol purposes only, not for pay equivalency. The pay systems and underlying personnel systems should not be confused. The fact is that the Federal workers are not fleeing for the private sector. The President's budget makes it a proper distinction between the clear need for the raise of the military pay, which he proposes at 3.5 percent, and a lesser priority of the Federal civilian workers at 1.5 percent.

So over the years that I have been here trying to close the pay gap with regard to the military, it has been very difficult. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has been a very strong advocate with regard to the civilian pay and increasing that over the years, and I do not want to mischaracterize him.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland for clarification.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I simply wanted to make the point, what I said was treating them disparately implied that they were second-class citizens. The implication in the gentleman's comments was that he disagreed with the implication that they were second class. There was no implication of that, clearly.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I accept the correction, and I thank the gentleman.

Just the point I want to make to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I know he is a very strong advocate, along with my other colleague for the Federal civilian workforce. I stand here an advocate of the military, and there is a tremendous pay gap; and every time we try to close that pay gap for the military, it has been hard be-

cause we come here to the floor, in the 12 years I have been here, and he says he agrees with me, but we have got to move the Federal civilian at the same time. And I just want him to know it is very hard.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Steven Strobbridge, who is a colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired, and director of Government Relations for the Military Officers Association of America, supporting this.

MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, March 30, 2004.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the nearly 380,000 members of the Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), I am writing to express MOAA's support of the principle of pay raise parity for the federal civilian workforce.

Pay comparability with private sector workers is a fundamental statutory requirement for both federal civilians and the uniformed services. To the extent such comparability is not sustained over time, our government will not be able to attract and retain the kinds and numbers of personnel it needs for a professional, highly qualified career work force.

Improved military pay raises in recent years have been aimed at restoring long-term comparability with private sector pay after decades of military pay caps. Those in the federal civilian workforce also have had their raises capped below comparability for many years.

Improved military pay raises in recent years have been aimed at restoring long-term comparability with private sector pay after decades of military pay caps. Those in the federal civilian workforce also have had their raises capped below comparability for many years.

While MOAA would not presume to recommend a particular civilian pay standard for the long term, we believe the resolution you propose, along with Representatives Wolf and Hoyer, represents a reasonable step in the right direction, given the well-documented years of federal pay raise caps.

Sincerely,

STEVEN P. STROBRIDGE,
Colonel, USAF (Ret),

Director, Government Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a strong advocate for military and Federal employees.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of H. Res. 581, not simply because I have the great honor to represent 15,000 civilian employees at Tinker Air Force Base and 6,000 at Ft. Sill Army Post and thousands of others throughout the district; not just because my own father, who had a distinguished 20-year career in the United States Air Force, followed that with, I think, an equally distinguished 20-year career as a civilian employee at Tinker Air Force Base, but because I think H. Res. 581 expresses equity, good management, smart personnel policy, and, frankly, is also an asset to our national defense.

Opponents of the idea of equal pay for military and civilian personnel quite often point to the inflation issue as something that they focus on. Frankly, I think the real question is the 32 percent wage gap between private sector and public sector employees, something that this House and this government has historically tried to address over time. I think we should continue on that path.

I also think it is of the utmost importance that we retain qualified personnel in Federal civilian service. Over 50 percent of that workforce is now within 5 years of retirement at Tinker Air Force Base. It is an extraordinarily skilled force. It needs to be encouraged; and, frankly, we need to have the incentives to recruit equally qualified people in the future.

I think in the end, Mr. Speaker, this is simply a matter of good policy. I have good friends on both sides of this issue. I think the motives are very good, but the reality is we know we need a first-rate military. We know we need to pay for that. We need a first-rate civilian personnel force to back them up when we are in conflict and, frankly, when we are not. So I am very proud to support this particular resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his previous statement, as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for his statement and his initiative in introducing this with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for his extraordinary leadership in the Committee on the Budget which has led to the 3 past years of this very provision being included in the budget.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and the leader of our caucus for his statement.

This is a very important issue, not just to those who represent large numbers of Federal employees but to the entire American people. We are talking about adequately compensating those who serve, who serve all of the interests of all of the American public.

At no time when we introduced this resolution or in the budget resolution have we ever suggested that the military should only get their pay increase if civilians get their pay increase. That is a total mischaracterization by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER). That is not the case. But we do want to make the case that there are a great

many civilian employees serving their country in a dedicated, brave way as well.

Just a couple of weeks ago, two DOD civilian employees were killed in what the Coalition Provisional Authority in Baghdad called "a targeted act of terrorism." There were hundreds of Federal civilian employees killed in a targeted act of terrorism in Oklahoma. The FBI, the CIA, the whole Department of Homeland Security, we can raise up the stature of people who are willing to put their lives on the line; but we can also point to all those clerks and managers and accountants and all the people who make the government run.

It is so easy to take it for granted because we have always had the most professional civil service with the highest integrity of any civil service in the world, and we take it for granted. But we are not going to be able to if we do not act responsibly here.

Health insurance premiums have been going up by double digits for the last several years. If we restrict Federal civilian employees to 1½ percent, their take-home pay is likely to be even less than it was last year.

We heard from the assistant secretary for Army Acquisitions. This is not a function that clearly should be contracted out. Army Acquisitions. He told us about the fact that in the last 10 years, the number of civilian employees working for the Army has declined from 100,000 to 50,000; and they have doubled their workload. They have twice as much work to do. But he shared with us his very deep concern, his very deep concern, that over the next 2 years half of that workforce is eligible for retirement. What happens then? These are dedicated professional employees.

This is a very important issue for all the people of this country. We as the people that the executive branch works for, we make the laws. We tell them what their priorities are. And the American people, who depend upon them for all their Social Security checks, their Medicare benefits, all of the various programs that have an enormous, profound impact on their lives, these people have to know that they are appreciated, they are respected. And how do we do that? More than words. We have to do that by giving them the level of compensation they are entitled to. That is what this is about. It is not a matter of talking the talk. We walk the walk by showing them that we appreciate what they do day in and day out.

I appreciate the gentleman for introducing this resolution, and let us get it passed.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I include in the RECORD a copy of the letter from the Executive Office of the President of the Office of Management and Budget in opposition to this resolution.

We hear people say, well, we have Federal civil service workers that go in

harm's way. The vast majority do not. But for those who do, what we have to do is avoid this across-the-board increase that consumes \$2.2 billion so that we can target the extra assistance where it is needed.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 30, 2004.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the House of Representatives begins consideration of a resolution on Federal pay policy, I strongly urge the House to support the Federal employee pay policy reflected in the President's FY 2005 Budget. The Administration believes this approach, rather than the one reflected in the proposed resolution, is the most effective way to achieve the desired result: to recruit, retain, and reward quality employees.

The President's Budget proposes to increase compensation for civilian employees by 2 percent, or by over \$2 billion, targeted to address specific needs and opportunities. The proposal includes: a 1.5 percent across-the-board pay increase to maintain civilian employee buying power; \$200 million spread across the agency budgets for use in addressing specific recruitment and retention needs; and, \$300 million for the Human Capital Performance Fund, which agencies can use to reward their highest performing employees. The resolution under consideration would instead support the same across-the-board increases for civilian workers that the President has proposed for military personnel.

The Administration strongly supports the proposed resolution's goal of providing sufficient compensation for civilian and military employees to support our critical efforts to recruit, retain, and reward quality employees effectively and responsibly. The Administration, however, does not believe that providing the same across-the-board increases for civilian workers that the President proposes for military personnel will help us achieve this goal.

If added to the President's proposal for \$2 billion in pay increases for civilian employees, the additional cost of providing every civilian employee with the identical across-the-board raise proposed for the military would be about \$2.2 billion. Because Congress cannot provide this funding without exceeding budget limits or shifting money away from higher priorities, this increase essentially acts as an "unfunded mandate" that agencies must cover within existing funds.

Federal civilian employees have enjoyed cumulative annual pay increases of 45.1 percent since 1993. For the last five years, Federal employees have received raises that exceed overall private sector wage growth. State governments, by contrast, have provided smaller increases for their employees when faced with similar resource constraints. In the past four years, many States have frozen pay completely at various points in time, and we are not aware of any State that in 2004 gave its workers as large an across-the-board raise as is being proposed for Federal workers this year.

In addition, Federal employees receive other types of pay increases. In 2005, we estimate the value of within grade and quality step increases as 1.3 percent, the value of promotions as 1.2 percent, and the value of cash awards as 1.3 percent of civilian payroll. While not everyone will receive these increases, with the 3.5 percent across-the-board pay increase that the proposed resolution supports, overall Federal employee compensation in 2005 would increase by about \$5 billion.

Federal employee benefits are also increasingly more attractive relative to those available in the private sector. These include a

defined benefit annuity and lifetime health benefits for as little as five years of service, as well as transit subsidies, long-term care insurance, preferential tax treatment of health insurance premiums, and flexible spending accounts for dependent and healthcare expenses. The Federal civilian benefits package increasingly stands out as one of the most comprehensive available anywhere.

Both civilian and military employees perform crucial functions on behalf of the American public. The Administration believes, however, that giving every civilian employee the identical raise proposed for the military does not support the goal of providing compensation to effectively and responsibly recruit, retain, and reward quality employees. Advocates for providing identical pay raises to civilian and military employees cite recruitment and retention problems, but we have no evidence that the Federal Government has widespread recruitment and retention problems. With respect to retention, the voluntary attrition rate is at a near historic low of 1.6 percent. Only in relatively few occupations are recruitment and retention problems an issue, and President's pay policy gives agencies the tools and resources to address these concerns.

The President's pay proposal provides sufficient pay not only to recruit and retain needed workers, but also to reward the government's highest performing employees. The Administration is implementing better agency performance appraisal systems that will be able to distinguish superior performance. Such systems will enable agencies to reward employees with funds from the Human Capital Performance Fund. These incentives will produce improved performance and results for the American people.

Our civilian and military employees are vital to the success of the Federal government in meeting its commitments to the American people. Federal workers should be rewarded with a pay policy that most effectively recruits, retains, and rewards quality employees. The Administration believes the pay policy included in the FY 2005 Budget supports those goals. While we recognize that the proposed Sense of the House resolution has no binding effect on either the budget or appropriations processes, we urge Members to oppose the resolution.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA B. BOLTEN,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

I reluctantly rise to oppose this measure. I know the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the author of the resolution, is one of the great advocates, as are many of the Members who have spoken, of our folks who are in civil service who support not only lots of domestic operations but also military operations, and I appreciate his advocacy for these great Americans.

And I also appreciate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the cosponsor, perhaps a guy that I feel is to some degree the conscience of this body and a great leader of this civil service constituency in his district, and also all the other Members who have spoken on behalf of the resolution.

The problem I have with the resolution is this: we have a limited amount

of money to operate national defense with this year; and, according to CBO, we are some \$30 billion a year behind in modernization. That means new equipment for our forces. That means replacing those 18-year-old helicopters and those 15-year-old fighter aircraft and making up that 8 to \$10 billion shortfall in munitions. And we pledged this year, and I pledged, to try to make sure that we shape the defense budget this year in such a way that we try to shift as much as \$2 billion into the theater, into the fighting theater where our soldiers and Marines are right now fighting against a very deadly enemy in the theaters in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And that means coming up with extra money for force protection; that means armor for vehicles; new sensor capability to be able to see the battlefield, tell where the enemy is at, and work surgically against him; and also munitions, which are in short supply. We need to recharge our munitions stockpiles because we have expended a great many of them.

For that reason, I hate to see that, if this action is followed by an appropriations shift that takes money from the operational military, and we have calculated roughly \$1 billion would come from the operational military, to move it over to accommodate the pay increases above the President's proposal, that means we take \$1 billion away from the accounts that do fund the force protection and the munitions and the extra surveillance and sensor capability that we are trying to direct and focus in the Afghan and Iraq battlefields this year. So for that reason, I reluctantly oppose this very well-intentioned motion. I think we need to focus on the task at hand. The emergency at hand is this shooting war that we are in right now.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

□ 1130

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and my other colleagues who have exercised leadership on this resolution.

This is an unusual procedure, because we are facing an unprecedented denial. In war and peace, there has always been pay parity. This is not the time to set up invidious comparisons between people who do the same kind of jobs, sometimes on the home front, sometimes overseas.

It has never been considered a reflection on the military for there to be pay parity, and we ought not inject that into this debate now. We take nothing from their sacrifice now, as we have taken none in the past. We know we have a volunteer army. We know most of our troops are support troops. We know that almost all of them do the same things that we do in civilian life. There are very few, in fact, in combat.

This is no time to break with pay parity, because if you think this will be remembered as the era of war, I tell you, this will always be remembered as the era of homeland security. This will be remembered as the era when we in fact called Federal employees to do what they have never had to do before, and that is to protect the homeland. The homeland is not being protected by the military. The homeland is being protected by civil servants here during alerts, by civil servants who in fact are taking care to see that we are not at risk right here. The last thing we need to do is to tell them that we are going to break pay parity, right when we expect more from them, right when we are counting on them to save us from risks that none of us know about today.

Indeed, these employees are being asked to do much more. The great bulk of them who are in DOD and Homeland Security are having their lives turned upside down with all kinds of systems being proposed that are revolutionary in the way you would pay them, evaluate them, involve them in collective bargaining; and now we want to say we are going to deny you, as well, as the pay parity you were entitled to when none of this was going on.

You want to do comparisons between Federal workers and the private sector? I do not think you want to go there. That has been one of the most controversial issues for decades, and we are still not at pay comparability. Indeed, for many years Federal service has been uncompetitive.

Young people for many years now have been going far more into the private sector than the Federal sector, and the quality of the Federal workforce is going to suffer for it. Both the House and Senate have had hearings and joint hearings on, of all things, recruitment and retention in the Federal civil service, because half of these folks could go out the door tomorrow or shortly after tomorrow.

They are greatly unappreciated as it is. Do not make it worse. Do not break the precedent of pay parity right when we are asking more from civilian employees of the civil service.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard discussions about how the vast majority of Federal employees do not go in harm's way. Let me make a comparison.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) has just raised an important point, and that is in the war on terrorism and protecting the homeland we are relying on our Federal employee workforce, and many of these people were drafted into this.

We look at the Oklahoma City bombings in my friend's home State, over 100 Federal employees died just for being Federal employees and for being there as a symbol of this government, their lives involuntarily on the line, dying for this country.

Officer Johnny Spann was killed in an Afghan prison uprising on November 25, 2001, the first American combat death in Afghanistan, a Federal civilian employee, a CIA employee.

Inspector Tom Murray, a 31-year veteran of the Customs Service, died from toxic fume inhalation during an inspection of the hold of a vessel at the Port of Gramercy in Louisiana in October of 2001.

Twenty-three firefighters died in wildland fire-fighting incidents in 2002, primarily in California and Colorado, where the fire season was especially severe. These account for almost a quarter of the on-duty deaths of firefighters in 2002, Federal employees.

Who are our Federal employees? Hundreds of Federal firefighters spent weeks without pause, working day and night to quell the multiple wildfires that consumed much of Southern California.

Coast Guard Chief Kevin Concepcion directed the safe and orderly seaborne evacuation of 70,000 confused and frightened people from Lower Manhattan amidst the chaos of the September 11 attacks.

FBI agents William Fleming and Ben Herren brought to justice two of the men responsible for the infamous 1963 bombing of an African American church in Birmingham, Alabama, 40 years after they committed the crime.

Dozens of foreign service officers have returned to the embassies in Nairobi and Kenya after bombs demolished the embassy buildings in 1998, killing and wounding dozens of embassy officials.

Employees from the Federal Highway Administration, the Social Security Administration, HUD, DEA, Agriculture, Secret Service, all of these died in the Oklahoma City bombings in April of 1995.

Three-and-one-half percent. Over 20 percent under what the Federal Salary Council recommended to the President Federal employees ought to get this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, were we to adopt this policy of across-the-board raises, we would prevent the ability to prioritize for those people who actually put their lives at risk and put themselves in harm's way. I have worked in local government, I have worked in State government, I have worked in the Federal Government. Typically we make a distinction between people, whether they are police, whether they are fire, whether they are law enforcement, whether they are in the military. We make a distinction between those who put themselves in harm's way when we consider what we need to do in employment.

But if all the resources are consumed on saying, no, we have got to give ev-

erybody an across-the-board increase, then we cannot target our efforts towards those people who do put themselves in harm's way. That is what the President's proposal seeks to do, have an adequate across-the-board cost-of-living increase, so that you therefore retain the resources to target the additional assistance where it is most justified. This resolution wipes out that approach. This resolution says, no, somebody that works at a desk, and maybe doing a very important job at that desk, has to be given the same increase as someone who puts their life in harm's way. That is a wrong approach.

The people that we have a challenge retaining are those who do put their lives in harm's way. But across-the-board, they virtually never had as little a retention problem as they do now in the Federal Government. A 1.6 percent attrition rate. That is it.

This is not a matter of keeping the Federal employees in general. This is a matter of conserving the resources so that we can target them, as the President's budget proposal wants to do, to where it is most needed.

I wanted to cite from the letter that the White House sent over: "If added to the President's proposal for \$2 billion in pay increases for civilian employees, the additional cost of providing every civilian employee with the identical across-the-board raise proposed for the military would be about \$2.2 billion dollars. Because Congress cannot provide this funding without exceeding budget limits or shifting money away from higher priorities, this increase essentially acts as an unfunded mandate."

The letter goes on to state: "The President's proposal is for targeting resources to where it is most needed, rather than taking this across-the-board approach that prevents us from making sure that we retain the people who have the specialties that are in highest demand and for whom we must compete with the private sector."

This is a sop to people who wanted to treat everyone the same because perhaps they are part of the same employee organization. That is not what we need to do.

We go to great measures to protect Federal employees. As the Representative of most of Oklahoma City, come out and see the new Federal building that is being dedicated in about a month's time and look at the extraordinary security measures that we have put into place to protect our Federal civilian workforce, because we know their value, we know their importance. But that does not mean that we treat everyone as though they were putting their lives in harm's way and, therefore, undercut what we do to keep the good people that do put their lives in harm's way on behalf of the citizens of this country.

We do not have the extra \$2 billion for the across-the-board increase this resolution seeks to do. We have got enough problems with the deficit already.

I ask people to oppose this resolution.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure the gentleman, and maybe I can talk him into supporting this resolution when I ask him to read it here, the language of the resolution itself makes it clear this is not across the board. It says: "Compensation for civilian employees and members of the uniform services must be sufficient to support our critical efforts to recruit, retain and reward quality people in government service, and to help achieve this objective, compensation for civilian employees should be adjusted at the same time and at the same proportion as our rates of compensation for members of the uniform services."

Nothing in there mandates across-the-board. This language, in fact, was changed from previous years to accommodate some of OMB's concerns.

But I have got to tell you, where I get the most concerned is that last year on this floor I put an amendment on this floor to add \$500 million for a Human Capital Compensation Fund so we could give out bonuses and award people on the basis of merit, and the gentleman's subcommittee did not fund it.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware that we did not have the money to fund it because the very across-the-board language that you propose today had already been put in and soaked up the money?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, no, I am not aware of that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the chairman of my committee, Mr. Chairman, that is inaccurate. It is inaccurate, because, as you know, you did not fund that in subcommittee. In subcommittee, the provision to which you refer had not been added.

So you are inaccurate. You had the money available. And, by the way, as you know, I supported that \$500 million so that we could give additional compensation above and beyond what the law requires. The law.

This is not some speculation. The law requires that we give special compensation to high performers. I agree with that premise, as does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman is aware, this authorization was authorized by the full House in an

up-or-down vote. Unfortunately, we called on the appropriators to fund it, the money was there, as the gentleman noted, earlier on before the additional money was appropriated; and it still was not funded. So it is easy to talk one way, but we have to look at consistency and action.

All we are asking the House to do today is do what we did last year, the year before, the year before, what the Senate did in their budget resolution. This is 20 percent below what the Federal Salary Council has recommended this year.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this resolution. However, it is regrettable that this resolution even needs to be offered. In my opinion, it should be a well-settled principle that Federal civilian employees will receive the same annual pay raise as military personnel. Unfortunately, we are faced with an administration that does not appreciate the importance of the Federal workforce.

We have seen countless examples of Federal employees coming under attack from this administration. Over the past 2 years, 800,000 civilian employees at the Departments of Homeland Security and Defense have seen the revocation of their collective bargaining rights, due process rights and appeal rights. We have seen an ideologically driven campaign to privatize Federal jobs.

This administration wants to use arbitrary numerical goals for converting Federal jobs; and when there are competitions between Federal employees and the private sector, the administration wants employees to compete with one arm tied behind their backs.

Now we see the continuation of efforts to shortchange Federal employees. In this year's budget, the President has proposed giving civilian employees a 1.5 percent raise, less than half, less than half the raise that military personnel will receive. That is unfair to the hard-working Federal workers who make personal and financial sacrifices to serve their country.

□ 1145

Much has been made of the enormous sacrifices of the military personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. These brave men and women deserve our deepest gratitude. However, we should not forget that civilian employees at the Defense Department and other agencies are playing an instrumental role in supporting both the war effort abroad and the war on terrorism at home.

Ironically, while the administration cannot seem to find enough money to

give raises to civilian employees, it has no problem awarding financial bonuses to its political appointees. In some agencies, the average bonus to political employees has exceeded \$11,000. That is outrageous.

Now, we have heard this is a matter of priorities. The priority for this administration is to give tax cuts to billionaires, not to adequately pay for civilian employees of the Federal Government.

I am pleased to be part of a bipartisan coalition of Members who value the contributions of Federal civil servants and believe they should not be treated as second-class employees. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It is the only fair thing to do to keep faith with those who are working for us and deserve a pay raise and should not be excluded because of priorities for billionaires getting tax cuts while our civilian employees do not get the parity that they deserve.

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

Mr. Speaker, we had some interesting discussion about, well, why have we not gone to this system of saying let us reward people based upon their performance. Let us target, let us target funds, as the President wants to do. And the gentleman asked, well, why was it not done in the appropriations bill last year?

That program has not been created. There is no program to fund. We could not put it in the subcommittee mark. The gentleman from Virginia chairs the committee that has the ability to bring the legislation to the floor, to promote what the President wants to do. Let us not undercut.

If the gentleman agrees it is a good idea, I agree it is a good idea, if the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) agrees it is a good idea, and certainly the White House promotes it, then instead of doing this one-size-fits-all across the board, why do we not support the President's proposal and bring that Human Capital Performance Fund, that is what he calls it, why do we not bring that legislation to the floor? But, for goodness sakes, do not pass this resolution soaking up the resources that would have to go to pay for performance.

The ball is in the court of the committee of the gentleman from Virginia. I know he is sympathetic toward the President's approach, but I am sure he would not want to adopt a resolution that defeats his ability to move the Federal Government to be more responsible, to say, we know that not all employees perform equally, not all are placing themselves in the same level of risk as others are, and we ought to be able to make distinctions.

Do the cost-of-living adjustment, the 1.5 percent that is proposed, that is already in the budget, but do not pass this resolution to take away the ability of pay for performance. Do not say that just because we have retention problems in the military and they are

so poorly underfunded that, therefore, we have to do the same for the Federal civil service.

The Federal civil service, in the last 7 years, for every dollar increase in the cost of living, has already gotten \$1.66 in increases, faster than anybody else. It is time to have a year where we say, let us hold back. Let us only do the cost of living adjustments, but, at the same time, put the pay for performance in place.

We do not need this. The turnover rate for Federal employees is at virtually an all-time low. There are spots where we need to be able to keep people with specific skill sets, and the President's proposal would let us address those. But we do not do it by giving a pay raise to the people that we do not have a problem retaining and then not be able to retain the people that do have the special skills.

Do not pass this resolution. Do not try to handcuff us and prevent us from reforming the Federal civil service process. We are being more than fair with the 1.5 percent. We do not need to go overboard.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me the time, as well as for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the concepts of equality, equal justice, equal opportunity, and equal pay have undergirded and guided the development of this Nation. One of the things that Americans have always been able to think ahead for is the idea that they are going to be treated equally, they are going to be treated fairly, and they are going to be compensated justly. We are simply talking about fair compensation. We are talking about the fact that we have an aging workforce in the civilian sector.

Recruitment is not as easy as one might think. Individuals are about to retire in large numbers, and there is a great deal of concern about our human capital, individuals to carry on the work of this great Nation.

So, again, I commend and compliment the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for initiating this resolution, I urge its strong passage, and suggest that it is not a slight in any way. We do not undervalue the importance of our military, but equally important are those in the civilian sector.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, and then allow the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) to respond and close, and then I will make a very brief closure.

I think it is important to note again that this resolution does not mandate

across the board. We took any language here that mandates that out. In fact, we have agencies right now where pay for performance is the rule. They are working under it at DHS. DOD passed a performance review last year. The IRS and FAA already have those provisions of pay for performance in there. Before this last Congress, GAO came and asked for it. They have it. These are agencies that our committee and other committees in the House, working together, are already working to pay for performance.

But if we do not pass this legislation, there can be no pay for performance. There will be no pay for performance without pay comparability. Otherwise, they do not even get the 1.5 percent, Federal employees. So this is a natural precursor to get what the gentleman from Oklahoma, what the administration, and what we all want. This has got to be there first.

So I think maybe we have a chicken-and-the-egg situation, but we have to have the money, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, before we can do the other kinds of things. And we took the mandatory, across-the-board language out of this resolution exactly for that purpose: to give us all an opportunity to work together, to give Federal employees pay comparability, but to do it in an appropriate fashion.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that people should vote for this resolution based upon someone's claim that, well, it really does not do anything, because the language, the very last phrase, makes it clear that it calls for the compensation for the civilian employees of the United States to be adjusted at the same time and in the same proportion as the rates of compensation for members of the Armed Forces. If the Armed Forces, as is proposed and as we know is going to happen, get 3.5 percent, then the Federal civil service would have to get 3.5 percent as well, rather than the 1.5 percent that is proposed.

Again, this has been looked at by the Office of Management and Budget, and I quote once more from their record about what this would cost. They say, "It would be about \$2.2 billion, and because Congress cannot provide this funding without exceeding budget limits or shifting money away from higher priorities, this increase essentially acts as an unfunded mandate that agencies must cover."

We are talking about a vote to spend an extra \$2.2 billion. That is what we are here about this morning. We are here because some people in the House insist that that ought to be the case, and they want to use this vote to leverage the appropriations process and everything else.

But the taxpayers are looking over our shoulders. They know that the Federal workers have gotten twice the cost

of living over the last 4 years, and they have not. Federal workers have had their pay improved far beyond what has happened in the private sector. It is not out of line to say, let us just hold it down to inflation this year, but let us make sure that we hold back the resources to target, to target pay where we most need it for recruitment or for people who are putting their lives at risk. That is what we ought to be doing. We should not be voting for this resolution.

I ask my fellow Members, Mr. Speaker, to join me in opposing this resolution.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

The world has changed. It might have been a decade ago where you looked at the Federal workforce being uninvolved and in a different light from our men and women in uniform somewhere else across the world. But, today, the battleground has shifted here to the Pentagon, to Oklahoma City, to Manhattan, to our embassies abroad, and it has seen in each instance Federal employees dying on the front lines, just performing their day-to-day duties as targets of terrorists. We see that the first individual killed in the Afghan war was a Federal civil servant. Every Federal employee now, as they go to work, is a potential target of a terrorist.

In addition to that, OMB's opposition to this is nothing new. We saw this under the previous administration. That is traditionally the line they take. That is why Congress passed and President Bush won, signed the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act in 1990, to try to have an independent body review what it would take to get pay comparability. Because the American taxpayer does not want an underfunded rocket scientist, a cancer researcher at NIH that we are not paying appropriately. We do not get top talent on the cheap, and that is not what they want.

So the Federal Salary Council appointed by President Bush made the recommendation. They recommended a 25 percent increase; and the administration said, no, we want 1.1 percent. All we are saying today is comparability says this ought to be at 3.5 percent, the same as military, and how we spend that money we can decide through the process as we move forward in the appropriations process.

This resolution does not even mandate it across the board. In fact, in some agencies, those have gone by the wayside as we formed the pay schedules there.

This is an important issue for this Congress. It is an important issue to our Federal workforce and our military workforce, of which we have shown support to some of those groups as well.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this. Let us send a message to our Federal

employees and our military personnel that we honor what they do, we value what they do, and we are going to pay them appropriately. I ask for support of this resolution.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H. Res. 581, which urges this administration to provide pay parity to civilian government workers and uniformed government workers.

I was greatly disappointed at the President's meager pay raise for Federal workers and feel it should be closer in line to the raise our uniformed service members received. I represent the Rock Island Arsenal, which employs about 6,000 civilian Department of Defense workers. Many of these employees are directly supporting our uniformed personnel in the war on terror. This includes many working around the clock to produce an urgent order of armored kits for our Humvees and trucks being sent to Iraq. Hundreds of other workers are either deployed or recently deployed from service in the Middle East to support our service members. Yet, unlike their uniformed counterparts, they only received modest pay increases.

Not only are Defense Department civilian workers serving in the war on terror, but Federal fire fighters, police, marshals, and armed agents of the FBI, DEA, ATF, Amtrak, Postal Service, and numerous other agents.

This administration wants to outsource our Federal employees, rewrite their labor rules, and ask them to do more with less. And then they hit them in their pocket book. We need to support our Federal workers and this resolution sends a strong message.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and let the President know our Federal workers deserve his respect.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 585, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 299, nays 126, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—299

Abercrombie	Bishop (GA)	Burns
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Burr
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Allen	Blumenauer	Cantor
Andrews	Boehmert	Capito
Baca	Boehner	Capps
Baird	Bonilla	Capuano
Baldwin	Bono	Cardin
Ballance	Boswell	Cardoza
Becerra	Boucher	Carson (IN)
Bell	Boyd	Carson (OK)
Bereuter	Bradley (NH)	Case
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Castle
Berman	Brown (OH)	Chandler
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Clay

Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce

Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Townes
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Cunningham
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hart
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Keller

Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Linder
McCrery
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Portman
Putnam
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reynolds

Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Vitter
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (SC)

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 31, 2004 at 4:20 p.m.:

That the Senate disagreed to House amendment S. Con. Res. 95; agreed to conference.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills during the recess today:

H.R. 2584, to provide for the conveyance to the Utrok Atoll local government of a decommissioned National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ship, and for other purposes;

S. 2057, to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members of the United States Armed Forces for certain transportation expenses incurred by the members in connection with leave under the Central Command Rest and Recuperation Leave Program before the program was expanded to include domestic travel;

S. 2231, to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant Program through June 30, 2004;

S. 2241, to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

NOT VOTING—8

Harris
Hulshof
Kirk
McHugh
Pickering
Rodriguez
Tanner
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1233

Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin, SIMPSON, BASS, FEENEY, CANNON, COX, ISSA, BACHUS, NEY, BONNER, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EVERETT and Mr. JEFFERSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1920

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida) at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NAYS—126
Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)

Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Culberson

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act. The goal of this legislation is to create a Medicare program that can provide for our seniors the quality health care in the future that Medicare has been able to provide in the past.

Without the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act we passed and the President signed, the quality of the health care Medicare could provide would not keep pace with modern medical science, period. This bill was not and is not primarily about prescription drugs, though I believe we were morally and medically obliged to make prescription drugs a part of Medicare for all seniors.

The modernization of Medicare was more significantly about two facts. With seniors living longer, chronic illness has become a major fact of life for our seniors; and Medicare, through its old-fashioned structure, literally cannot pay for the preventive programs that can help seniors with chronic illnesses maximize their health and well-being and minimize their visits to the emergency room and the hospital.

Preventive health integrated into Medicare for seniors with chronic illness can both reduce costs and improve the quality of care available to our seniors. This must be done for the quality of life of our seniors but also for the sheer survival of Medicare.

One-third of our seniors have five or more chronic illnesses, and this third uses 80 percent of the resources. In every other sector of the population, we are seeing disease management programs increase the quality of care, increase the well-being of patients and reduce the costs of health care. We must do no less for our seniors.

We are morally, medically and fiscally bound to integrate disease management into Medicare, both into the plans that Medicare offers to our seniors and into the fee-for-service system that has long been historically the primary means for Medicare to deliver health care services to our seniors.

Only the House bill offered disease management as a new program under Medicare; and through the conference committee we strengthened this program, we broadened it, and we actually gave to those who manage Medicare the right to demonstrate various disease management programs and then simply roll them out to benefit all seniors and all Medicare programs without coming back to Congress. We delay things. We make them difficult. This is a matter of life for our seniors. It is a matter of quality health care for our seniors.

The Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act is just that. It is about prescription drugs and modernizing Medicare so that it will be prepared and capable of delivering cutting-edge, state-of-the-art health care to our seniors and particularly to those seniors with chronic illness.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may take the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. BROWN) time.

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

There was no objection.

THE ADMINISTRATION GIVETH AND THE REPUBLICAN CON- GRESS TAKETH AWAY

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, we have now passed the budget in the House, one in the Senate, and they are starting a conference committee. We are going to have a product out here one of these days soon, but this budget will be perfect proof that the administration giveth and the Republican Congress taketh away. The administration gives massive cuts to the rich; the Republican Congress takes Federal unemployment benefits away from average Americans. That is the way it has been in this administration.

Millionaires get an average cut on their taxes of \$112,925. The average American, on the other hand, gets \$676. Why should a millionaire get \$112,000 and the average working person in this country gets only \$676? They have no answer for that.

They have an answer that is sort of strange. They say, well, these tax cuts are going to allow jobs to occur. If you give a lot of money to rich people, suddenly, miraculously, jobs will kind of sprout up out in the fields or in the factories. No proof of that whatsoever.

We have been following the President's ideas for three-and-a-half years, and this will be the first administration since the Hoover administration, since the Hoover administration, 1928 to 1932, that the administration has not produced one single job. They have lost jobs.

February was a particularly good month. You read the newspaper and they say, oh, the economy is recovering. We do not have to give unemployment benefits to anybody because the economy is recovering. How do we know the economy is recovering? We know it because the stock market is going up. What does that mean to somebody that does not have a job, the stock market is going up? They spent all their savings and their 401(k) and everything else to keep afloat, and this

administration says because the stock market is going up we have a recovery and we do not need to extend unemployment benefits, in spite of the fact that we have \$20 billion sitting in the trust.

All it requires is the President to say to the Congress, move it. Republicans will never do it. They do not care.

□ 1930

But the fact is that in February, in this recovery, 21,000 jobs were created. That is 400 jobs for every State. Now, maybe in North Dakota 400 jobs is quite a lot, but in California it is nothing.

Not one single one of those jobs was a private sector job. Remember, we gave all that money to those rich people and they were going to create these jobs? They did not create one single job in February. That is a jobless recovery, and the President ought to be able to see that. We could see it in December when we started talking about this.

In my State, 80,000 people have gone off unemployment since December; and the government says, well, we have this \$20 billion but we are saving it. For what? To give another tax break, perhaps. You have to ask yourself what kind of an administration is this. They talk about compassionate conservatism, but I do not know what that means anymore.

We went to a workers' bus ride today, people who come to this city to tell us their problems. This guy who had been working in a paper mill up in Maine said, my grandfather worked in that mill, my father worked in that mill, I thought I would retire in that mill; but I lost my job, and now I have to go to the food bank to make it.

Think about it. Think about the loss of dignity. Think about the inability to feed your kids. But the President sits down in the White House and says, well, they do not need it; they just need to try a little harder, or maybe they can take their tax cut. They do not get a tax cut; they do not have a job.

For every person unemployed in this country there are three of them looking for every job that is created. The only reason the numbers have come down at all is because the President decided that he would not count them if they were not looking anymore.

This budget is a fraud and the American people should know it.

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

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

THE BUDGET AND PRESCRIPTION
DRUG COVERAGE

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam Speaker, being a member of the Committee on the Budget, I have to say that the budget that we passed in the House I do not believe is a fraud at all. It does two things that are very important. One, it restrains spending, which we need to do in order to get the deficit under control; and it also helps the economy to keep the government's spending down. For the first time really since 1995, when Republicans took control of the House, we are actually going to be freezing spending in many accounts. In fact, other than the security accounts and domestic discretionary spending, we will be getting spending under control and restraining spending, which I think is exactly what we should be doing. Second is that it puts in place measures to ensure that the economic growth that has begun continues. The gentleman may not have seen that in his district in Washington State, but we have certainly seen it around the country.

In fact, during the last 6 months, our economy grew faster than it has grown in the last 20 years, and jobs are coming back. Every month, over the last 6 months, we have seen job increases. Not as much as we would like to see, and all of us would like to see more, but the way to do that, obviously, is not to raise taxes on the American people, particularly some of those people the gentleman talked about, who he described as the wealthy. These are people who are businesses. Because a lot of small businesses in this country, in fact most small businesses are not incorporated, they are subchapter S, or partnerships, or sole proprietors; and they pay taxes at the individual level. Those are the people who are creating most of the jobs, our small businesses; and so we do not want to tax them at this point just as the economy is getting back on its feet.

So I think it is a good budget. I wish we could reduce the deficit even more, but it reduces the deficit in half by 4 years; the Senate version reduces it in half by 3 years.

Madam Speaker, I am actually here tonight to talk about another part of the budget, and that is the part that leaves room to provide for a new benefit under the Medicare program for prescription drug coverage.

After years and years of talking about this in this House, over in the other House, around the country, politicians have had a good time telling seniors we are going to give you prescription drug coverage, it is going to be great; but we have not delivered. Finally, late last year, this House voted on a bipartisan basis to provide prescription drug coverage, and I am very proud of that.

Is it perfect? No, it is not what anybody would think would be the perfect

bill based on their situation. Is it a good benefit? Absolutely, yes. And it is a substantial commitment by this Congress to be sure we modernize Medicare. As the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) said earlier, we need to modernize the program. She talked about in addition to prescription drug coverage all the wonderful new preventive benefits, all the new help for people with chronic disease.

It was time to take a 1960s program and be sure it added this important element of prescription drug coverage, which was not a big part of anybody's care back in the 1960s. Now it is a huge part of seniors' care. And seniors back home in Ohio, where I am from, are delighted they are going to get some help with their prescription drug coverage, because they rely more and more on prescription drugs, and people rely on prescription drugs to stay out of hospitals and not to have to have procedures. Instead of having a very expensive heart operation, now you can take Lipitor and keep your cholesterol down, and that should be covered by Medicare. And it will be now.

The Medicare bill does involve some trade-offs. We had limited resources. We spent \$400 billion over a 10-year period, which is a lot of money, given the deficit that we have. But we thought it was so important to do it. But it does not provide 100 percent coverage. What it does provide is a real benefit, though; and let me talk about what it does and does not do.

A lot of what I have seen in the national media and what opponents of the law have said just is not accurate. Some have said that seniors will be forced into this new prescription drug plan and forced to pay premiums they may not want to pay. That is not true. It is entirely voluntary. If seniors do not want to sign up for it, they do not have to.

It will be roughly \$35 a month for most Americans. But for about 35 percent of Americans, those who are under 150 percent or 135 percent of poverty, there will be no premium at all. But for those Americans who will pay a premium, it is about \$35 a month.

The Department of Health and Human Services, the nonpartisan experts there, the Congressional Budget Office, again nonpartisan group, think the vast majority of Americans will sign up. But they do not have to. It is a voluntary program.

Opponents are also saying that this new voluntary benefit will cause employers to drop retiree coverage for those fortunate enough to have it. Well, there are seniors, maybe a third of seniors, who have coverage from their spouse or from themselves working for an employer. We want to be sure those people continue to get coverage, and this legislation absolute has just the opposite effect. It will not drive people away from it. In fact, it will give people the ability to keep that coverage because it provides an incentive for employers to keep people

covered. We have never done that before, including the other Medicare bills that just about everybody in this Chamber has voted for in one way or another.

That is extremely important, because we want to encourage people to continue to have coverage. Over 20 percent of the cost of the bill, \$85 billion, is set aside just for that purpose. AARP supports this bill. And one reason they support it is this provision was important to them, and it is in the bill.

Some opponents are also saying that the legislation would have been less costly if it had focused on those who really need it. That is exactly what it does. Most of the benefit goes to low-income seniors and those who have high drug costs. As I said earlier, those who are low-income seniors, under 135 percent of poverty, do not pay a premium, do not pay any copays, and are able to get prescription drugs with only \$1 or \$5 at the prescription drug counter.

This is a good bill focusing on those who need the coverage the most.

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

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

9/11 COMMISSION

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Bush White House finally succumbed to intense and well-deserved pressure and agreed to allow National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice to testify under oath before the independent commission investigating the 9/11 terror attacks.

I am glad that Dr. Rice will publicly testify before the commission. This is an important step towards learning about the events surrounding the terrible attacks that occurred in New York and Washington, D.C. on September 11. Now we can prevent such events from ever happening again if we get the information that has been withheld.

But why is it that the Bush administration agreed to do the right thing only after receiving intense pressure from the public and from Republican appointees on the 9/11 Commission? Why does the White House time and again fail to quickly and transparently disclose what transpires behind its closed doors? After all, who could possibly provide better information in the fight against terrorism than those top White House officials, those who served the administration during that fateful day on September 11?

Remember, and we cannot forget, that the Bush administration initially

tried to prevent Congress from creating the independent commission in the first place. Since then it has failed to hand over critical documents and fully cooperate with the commission's stated goal of providing a full and complete account of the circumstances surrounding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, including preparedness for and the immediate response to the attacks. Even more recently, the White House refused to support the commission's request for more time to complete its work.

To me, it seems like the White House is less than enthusiastic about getting to the bottom of these catastrophic events. As part of the deal struck for allowing Dr. Rice to testify, the 9/11 Commission had to agree in writing not to require additional public testimony from any White House officials, including Dr. Rice. The 9/11 Commission agreed to these terms, but this deal means that regardless of what the commission may learn in future months, no other White House official will be allowed to publicly testify under oath.

That is like an attorney asking a judge if half of the witnesses to a crime can skip the trial. It is a ridiculous concept.

President Bush and Vice President CHENEY will meet with the commission, although privately, and from what I understand, will read their remarks without taking questions. This is very disappointing. I think the American people, and especially the families of the victims of September 11, deserve to know what their leaders knew and when they knew it.

I remember when the country rallied together in September and October of 2001. These episodes of unity begin and end with the President. Tough times call for strong leadership. It is once again time for President Bush to lead this country forward, towards truth and reconciliation. He should help us grow as a people by being the very first person to volunteer himself for public testimony. He should avail himself and his staff to the 9/11 Commission so that we might learn something about our past and protect ourselves for the future.

The American people, Madam Speaker, deserve no less from their Commander in Chief.

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

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

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. Madam Speaker, this is a good budget we

passed out of this House and sent to conference. I am hoping that the kind of frugal budget that we sent to conference is going to come back to this House for a final budget of the House and the Senate.

One thing that the budget did not deal with is unfunded liabilities. Unfunded liabilities are the promises that politicians make when they do not know where the money is coming from in later years. Last week, the actuaries of the Social Security Administration and the Medicare trust fund came up with their estimates of unfunded liabilities, and that is what this chart shows. It should scare the heck out of us.

The Social Security and Medicare trustees have calculated that these programs have \$73.5 trillion in unfunded liabilities. Now, if you divide the population of the United States, which is roughly 290 million, into that \$73.5 trillion, you end up with over a quarter of a million dollars for every man, woman and child that somehow is going to be responsible for paying for these benefits over and above what we have promised because the money coming in from the FICA tax, and that FICA tax supports Social Security and Medicare, over and above the money coming in in revenues from that tax, we are still short \$73.5 trillion.

□ 1945

Medicare part A is short \$21.8 trillion; Medicare part B, \$23.2 trillion; Medicare part D, the drug program that we passed 4 months ago, \$16.6 trillion.

It is interesting on the prescription drug bill that Tom Savings, one of the actuaries, estimated at the time it was passed that the unfunded liability would be \$7 trillion. His estimate now is \$16.6 trillion.

The danger, of course, is that what we are doing in effect is acting like our problems are so important today that it justifies taking the money of our kids and our grandkids that they have not even earned yet. The unfunded liabilities, in addition to the debt that we are accumulating, now over \$7 trillion, is a huge liability to leave to our kids.

I am a farmer from Michigan. What we have traditionally tried to do is pay off the farm so that our kids had a little better chance than we did. Instead, we are now faced with a situation, and here is my political take on it. Right now roughly 50 percent of the working population pays less than 1 percent of the total income tax in this country. What we have done is become more and more progressive with the easy flow of language and justification to tax the rich, but here is 50 percent of the population that has little stake but to ask candidates that are running for Congress for more government services rather than less, and politically it has seemed to be to the advantage of politicians to make more and more promises. This represents how many prom-

ises we have made over and above our ability to pay for it.

I did this chart, this was also with Tom Savings' help, just to show that in 16 years it is going to take 28 percent of our general fund budget to pay for the makeup difference in Medicare and Social Security. By 2030, it is going to take almost 53 percent of the total budget.

So what do we do? How do we deal with this? Here is what this Congress, the House and the Senate and the White House has done in the past. This is when we run short of funds in Social Security.

It started out with 2 percent in 1940, 2 percent of the first \$3,000. It ran short of money, so in 1960 we raised it to 6 percent of the first \$4,800. In 1980, we ran short again, so we raised it to 10.16 percent of the first \$26,000; and then in 2000, 12.4 percent of the first \$76,000. In 2004, now, today, 12.4 percent of the first \$89,000. So what we have done is either reduced benefits, increased taxes or a combination of both. That is what we did in 1983.

I just call on my colleagues and I call on the American people, Madam Speaker, to ask their Members of Congress what bill have you written, what bill have you signed on to to make sure that we keep Social Security and Medicare solvent and not leave the total bill up to our kids?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). 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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to replace the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on the list.

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

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, what would your nightmare budget look like? Can you imagine a budget that would cut support for homeland security and small business development, that would do virtually nothing to improve one of the most sluggish economic recoveries in American history, that would break the Contract with America by raising the debt ceiling under cover of a budget resolution, that would balloon the debt and the deficit to previously unimagined dimensions, and that would do all of

this less than 5 years before the first of the baby boom generation begins to retire?

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that nightmare is a reality; and this reality has been created by the President and the House Republican leadership.

In the face of the worst fiscal reversal in this Nation's history, almost \$10 trillion since President Bush took office, the Republican response has been to propose more and more of the same failed policies. Finding themselves in a hole, their motto is, just keep digging. There is no clearer example of this than the phony pay-as-you-go proposal in the Republican budget that requires offsets for entitlement spending but not for tax cuts.

Yesterday, Democrats and moderate Republicans came together and voted to instruct the House-Senate budget conferees to institute a real pay-as-you-go proposal, akin to the one that brought us out of deficits and into surpluses in the 1990s. But, as has become standard operating procedure around the House lately, when the vote did not turn out the way the Republican leadership liked, they kept that vote open and began the arm-twisting; and after 28 minutes they had twisted enough arms to bring the vote to a tie and to defeat this effort at sound budget policy.

So now we are left with a budget in conference that would provide the worst of both worlds. It sends us over the cliff fiscally while at the same time radically reducing funding for education, the environment, transportation, health care and law enforcement.

Let me focus, Madam Speaker, for a moment on what may come as a surprise to many Americans who have listened to the Republican leadership and the President spend a lot of time talking about homeland security and the importance of our first responders. This budget shows that talking is about all they are willing to do for our first responders, our police, our fire departments, our medical personnel.

The Republican budget makes significant cuts in Homeland Security and Department of Justice funding for first responders that results in an overall reduction in funding for our police of 33 percent, with a 50 percent reduction in funding for police in smaller cities and rural areas. They also cut funding for firefighters by one-third at a time when the Federal Emergency Management Agency is reporting that over two-thirds of fire departments in this country operate with staffing levels that do not meet the minimum safe staffing levels required by OSHA and the National Fire Protection Association.

The Speaker yesterday concluded the debate on the budget resolution by saying the reason it was important to cut taxes for millionaires was because millionaires are the small business owners who are creating all the jobs in this country. Our friend, the gentleman

from Ohio, just repeated that argument on this floor tonight.

Some of those millionaires are small business owners, but again the Republican budget shows the true motivation of our friends on the other side of the aisle. The Bush administration and the Republican leadership have fought to zero out funding, in fact, for the Small Business Administration's flagship 7(a) loan program that provides close to 30 percent of the long-term loans for small businesses; and they zero out countless other small business programs like Microloans and others geared toward minority businesses. If, as the Speaker implied, the reason for tax cuts for millionaires was really to help small businesses, why did it take an extended press and letter-writing campaign orchestrated by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Small Business, to get the Republican leadership to finally back off of some of these cuts in Small Business Administration funding?

The answer, I am afraid, is obvious. The tax cuts were not meant to help small businesses or to spur the economy. They were meant to provide a windfall for the most fortunate among us.

Governing is about getting our priorities straight and taking the public trust seriously. Through the Spratt alternative budget resolution, fiscally responsible Democrats have made our priorities clear: fund the programs America needs like education, health care, housing, homeland security and safety net programs, balance our budget by freezing scheduled tax reductions for those making over \$500,000 a year, and target tax cuts in ways that benefit ordinary Americans and stimulate our economy.

There is still time, Madam Speaker, for our colleagues to wake up and reject the Republican nightmare budget and to pass a budget that points to a brighter future. House-Senate conferees could start by adopting real pay-as-you-go rules. I urge them to gauge the House's true sentiment and do just that.

IN HONOR OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in observance of Social Work Month. Since 1984, March has officially been designated as a month to acknowledge and recognize that social workers make meaningful and humanitarian differences and contributions to people in communities all over the world.

According to government health statistics, 60 percent of the Nation's mental health services are delivered by social workers. Trained social workers

provide more than 40 percent of disaster-related mental health services for the American Red Cross. Roughly 600,000 social workers are dedicated to ensuring that people of all ages, creeds, sexual orientations and nationalities have access to information, resources and services. They often make all the difference in the world to individuals and families who might otherwise fall through the cracks into hopelessness and despair. Social workers measure success by helping all those in need of basic services to achieve their goals on their own terms.

Often working behind the scenes, social workers are trained to address problems that some cannot see or issues that others hope will simply go away, drug addiction, family violence, joblessness, homelessness, mental illness, prejudice and many other conditions which affect millions of people every day, leaving them with little hope and few options.

According to the National Association of Social Workers, social workers help to open the doors of access and opportunity to those in greatest need through training and dedication. Moreover, social workers also actively advocate for changes in policy and legislation that strengthen the social safety nets that make a critical difference to so many.

Social workers have been at the forefront of many social movements. Some of the pioneers who were actively involved in creating social change include Dr. Dorothy Height, Jane Addams and Whitney Young.

Dr. Height was not only a giant in the civil rights movement, she also developed several model programs to combat teenage pregnancy, to address hunger in rural areas, worked as a proponent for AIDS education, implemented a project to expand business ownership by women and to provide funds for vocational training, and much more. She received a Congressional Gold Medal last week in recognition of these works as one of the preeminent social and civil rights activists of her time. In addition, she was awarded the Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian distinction, by President Bill Clinton in 1994. In fact, she has been acknowledged for her leadership by every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Jane Addams, another great social worker who built Hull House, which is in Chicago in my district; Whitney Young, former president of the National Urban League, and the list goes on and on and on.

In addition, there are several social workers who serve in our body, individuals who were engaged as social workers before being elected to Congress: Representatives SUSAN DAVIS, BARBARA LEE, CIRO RODRIGUEZ and ED TOWNS, as well as Senators BARBARA MIKULSKI and DEBBIE STABENOW. All of these individuals have made tremendous differences.

I simply come, Madam Speaker, to commend those who engage themselves

in the profession of social work, recognize the great achievements and accomplishments that they have made and urge we recognize their importance to our society.

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

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

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

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

THE NATIONAL BUDGET

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, here we go again. Here we are to talk about a subject our majority colleagues and our administration do not want to talk about. They are hoping it will just go away. That subject is our national budget or, more directly, the conspicuous lack thereof.

Madam Speaker, my constituents ask me all the time, what do I think is the most important challenge facing our country? What is the one thing that we have to work on more than anything else? I can reply to them, in all honesty and candor and directness, that it is the very solvency of their Federal Government.

Why should that be? Why is it not the economy? Why is it not education? Why is it not our deteriorating relationship with the rest of the world? Why is it not Social Security?

The reason is simple. Without a strong fiscal underpinning, we cannot do everything or anything else. We can have a great old talk, we can have a great old debate, but unless the fiscal solvency of our country is strong, we are not going anywhere. Put another way, unless we take care of today, our children will not be able to take care of tomorrow.

We think we all know now, do we not, that we are in pretty bad shape? In fact, we are in real bad shape; and we are going downhill fast. The largest deficits we have ever seen, no end in sight, debt going up, interest rates going up, irresponsible budgeting, like going out only 5 years of a budget when we know that the big expenses come in the sixth year.

And we all know that the budget passed by this House just a week ago by a mere three-vote margin is not going to solve that problem. In fact, it is going to worsen it.

How did we get here? How did we ever allow ourselves to come to this place?

Just 3, 4 years ago we were on the right track. We had spending under control. We had revenues coming in. We had budgets that were heading towards balance. We had debt ceilings that were low relative to GDP.

□ 2000

How did we arrive here? Well, the first thing we did is pretty obvious. We consistently reduced revenues while increasing expenses. What do we expect when we do that over a period of years? Second, though, we did not have basic rules to live by. When we are talking about whether to increase this particular program or increase this particular tax or reduce this particular program, we can talk about that program or that tax all we want, but it has got to fit into a big picture. And those are rules to live by; and if we live within those rules within that box, we end up with balanced budgets because we make decisions that are related to each other.

And, third, the rules that we did have, we ignored. We talked at length about the first consequence. We have talked about that for many years now. I think it is finally sinking in. We cannot both slash revenues and increase expenses and expect everything to be okay; and yet that is what the budget we just passed and sent into a conference with the Senate does.

Yesterday, we talked at length about the second part of it, rules that have worked in the past and that we no longer have, PAYGO. PAYGO, a very simple concept that we pay as we go. That as we reduce in one area, we have to increase in another area. We talked about consequences that when we reduce over here, there is a consequence that has to be addressed over here. That is what balance is. This is balance. Those rules set the boundaries for what we could do. PAYGO, that is what this House just rejected yesterday on a vote of 209 to 209. That is what the Senate has done. I support the Senate and praise the Senate for its actions to institute PAYGO, and I beg those conferees going in on behalf of the House to do the right thing.

But today I want to address the third part of it, rules that exist today that are not followed. We have under our system a debt ceiling. It is designed as a check and balance. It is designed to make each one of us stand up and say that no matter how much debt we accumulate because of the decisions, no matter how reckless, no matter how irresponsible, for that matter, we have to vote separately to increase the total debt that we collectively carry through our U.S. Government. And that is what we are doing. We are carrying debt. When we run deficits year after year after year, the money does not just grow out of nowhere. It does not grow on trees. It is not found in a stash somewhere. We borrow it. We issue notes, bonds. We take it out of trust funds. We borrow it. And the total amount is supposed to be limited, and

we have that on the books; but we are ignoring it. In 2001 when this administration started, there was a debt limit substantially lower than where it is.

I want to say one thing in conclusion. A vote for the budget is a vote to increase the debt limit. We have voted to increase the debt limit. We have not taken a separate vote. So when people ask their Member of Congress, did he or she vote for the budget resolution, if the answer is yes, they voted for a substantial increase in the debt limit. Do not hide it. Let us be honest in our budgeting. Let us do this right.

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

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

There was no objection.

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, I want to follow up on comments recently advanced by my colleague from Hawaii, someone who has so quickly thrown himself, tried to make some sense of them, and I appreciate very much the gentleman's conclusions.

We have got a runaway debt. We have got a very serious financial situation facing this country.

We are all familiar with the concept of credit card limits. Maybe we get pretty little limits. Maybe we get even generous limits. But somewhere there is a limit on how much money we can run up on our credit card.

The Nation, similarly, Congress establishes the limit, the credit card limit, for the Federal Government. We do that by a vote of Congress, how much money we are allowed to borrow as a country. And we have got a limit of \$7.384 trillion, \$7.384 trillion. We are allowed to borrow that much as a Nation.

That might give one pause. One might wonder how in the world are we going to get that debt paid off before we all leave the workforce, retire, and turn the country over to our children. Surely it would not be fair to leave our children with this debt.

As bad as this credit card limit is, as troubling as it ought to be to all of us, \$7.384 trillion, I have got very bad news for the Members. In the budget conference presently underway in the bowels of the Capitol, there will be an additional borrowing authority added to this country. The bill, the budget bill, to come out of conference to be voted on by the House of Representatives, will raise the credit card limit for our Nation. We do not know how much because no one is talking about this in public. No one wants the American people to realize that \$7.384 trillion is not enough, that we are going to raise it even more by \$1 trillion, more by \$2 trillion. One projection that we have seen from the majority would take the credit card limit of this Nation over \$10 trillion.

One of the things I think that is lost in financial debates is these numbers get too big and one really does not know what they mean. They are just enormous. I went recently to an instruction course on how to teach mathematics. And the presenter said 1 trillion, do we know how many seconds are in 1 trillion? If we took 1 trillion seconds, we would go back in time 16,000 years. So obviously 1 trillion is a staggering number, and we are now finding that, under the budget plans of the majority party and the administration that drive this national debt ever higher, \$7.384 trillion is not enough. I think the American people had better say it is enough.

We do not as families, we do not as families plan our financial affairs where mom and dad run up the credit cards, happily thinking the kids will pay them off. I know of families that I represent much like the family that raised me, just an awful lot of sacrifice in the mom and dad to leave things better for the kids, not tipping it on its head where we really do not care what happens afterwards, after we are gone.

If that is how we operate as families, as moms and dads worrying about making things better for our children, why should this Nation representing all the moms and dads in this country be running it a way so significantly different? Why should this Nation run up a debt like there is no tomorrow? Because there is a tomorrow, and it will be our children's tomorrow, and our children's tomorrow will be diminished by the fact that this generation is refusing to pay its way.

I am going to vote against the budget that comes out of conference because I believe it is wrong, absolutely wrong, to raise the borrowing limit for this country, leaving more debt for our children, when there is no plan anywhere in terms of how we ever get out of this mess.

The minority advanced a plan that brought us to a balanced budget in about 8 years. Some might think that is just not fast enough. That was a very difficult task. That is how far in the hole we now are. But the majority budget does not have any plan at all.

And that is why they want to raise the debt, and that is why their budget should be rejected. We owe it to our children to get our Nation's finances back on track.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

IRAQ AND SADDAM HUSSEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, tonight I would like to spend a few minutes talking about an update on a situation on the various inquiries as to what happened before 9/11. Most importantly, the work that they are doing is taking a look at putting together a series of recommendations that will enable us to improve our intelligence capabilities and improve our response capabilities into the future.

As I was listening to some of the earlier speakers, someone said when that happens and these inquiries present their work and they make their recommendations and then Congress, of course, will have the opportunity to review those recommendations and we may or may not implement them, the comment then was made: and then we know that an event like 9/11 will never happen again.

As much as I would like to endorse that comment, I do not believe it is accurate. On 9/11 we, as a Nation, were surprised; and I believe that in the future, regardless of the recommendations that come forward, regardless of how effectively we implement them, we will be surprised again.

Let me just lead up to 9/11 and outline some of the things. What do we know today? We know this: that in March of 2003, the United States, we led a coalition of over 30 countries in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The action was undertaken as a last resort. Iraq had been in noncompliance or material breach of 16 U.N. Security Council resolutions spanning a period of 12 years to remove the threat posed by Saddam to his people, the Gulf region, and the world.

A couple of things I really want to point out here is that some have said this was an initiative by the Bush administration, and later on I will go through some of the quotes by the previous administrations and also the documentation and the data that shows that throughout the 1990s, the administration, Congress, and others saw Saddam Hussein and Iraq as a threatening menace to his own people, to the region, and to the world. A consistent pattern.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq was a constant and immediate threat to his neighbors in the Gulf region. And what did Saddam do in the Gulf region? Under Saddam, Iraq fought a decade-long war against Iran and launched an unprovoked invasion of Kuwait. After Iraq's defeat in the Gulf War in 1991, Iraq rebuilt its military strength and continued to use the threat of military action in attempts to intimidate neighboring countries.

The pattern is pretty clear. In the region Saddam Hussein treated his neighbors brutally. With his own people we know that Saddam Hussein was a mass murderer. We removed that capability from him. The day we hauled him out

of that spider hole, he no longer had the capability to again be a mass murderer. He was a mass murderer and will be held accountable for the crimes against his neighbors and the crimes against his own people.

It is estimated that somewhere between at least 400,000 and perhaps 1.2 million Iraqis were killed by his brutal regime. His security service is responsible for the disappearance of thousands of Iraqis, hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, perhaps millions, who ended up in mass graves. And his military used chemical weapons not only against Iran, but also against Iraqi citizens. For over a decade prior to Operation Iraqi Freedom, Iraq was on the U.S. State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism. Saddam's regime attempted to assassinate former President Bush in 1993.

□ 2015

His security intelligence services maintained strong links to international terrorist groups. Prior to the Gulf War, Iraq amassed an arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, and it possessed an advanced nuclear weapons program. After the Gulf War, despite the U.N. inspections that continued through 1998, the United States, along with the United Nations and many individual countries, such as Germany and France, assessed that Iraq continued to possess and develop weapons of mass destruction.

Post-Operation Iraqi Freedom, the evidence shows that Saddam, in contravention of Iraq's responsibilities under multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions, continued to maintain elements of his weapons of mass destruction programs and had a clear goal to rebuild these programs.

It is clear: Iraq and Saddam Hussein proved an evil menace to his own people, to the people in the Gulf and to the rest of the world. It is not brand new.

As we go through this, there is a bipartisan consensus as to what this looked like. February 17, 1998, this is a speech that President Bill Clinton gave: "Iraqi agents have undermined and undercut U.N. inspectors. They have harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras, literally spirited evidence out of the backdoors. And talking about the different types of predators of the 21st century: "They will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen. There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world. There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region and the security of all the rest of us. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the

very kind of threat Iraq poses now: a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists who travel the world. If we fail to respond today, Saddam will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity."

"I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them," another quote from the same speech.

One of the disappointing things that has happened, especially in the last few weeks, is that people are trying to rewrite history, rewrite who did what. President Bush after 9/11 did not go back and collect these comments from the previous President and did not go back and measure those comments versus the actions that were taken. The President said we need to move forward. We are at war. We do not have the time and the energy to look back and to try to point a finger or identify a single individual or group of individuals who failed.

The President recognized exactly the type of threat that we faced, the same type of threat that Bill Clinton identified in 1998, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists. Maybe the terrorists on 9/11 used a weapon of mass destruction that was different than what we expected when they crashed planes into buildings, but there is no doubt that there was a consistent theme that already identified this threat in the 1990s.

But our President said it is important to recognize that we are at war, and we need to get on a full-scale footing to combat this war and to win this war, and we are not into the blame game. What we have seen in the last 2 to 4 weeks is, I believe, people starting to use this and trying to use it for partisan benefit. This issue is too important and too critical to the future of this country for it to be used as a partisan weapon.

I think that President Bill Clinton in the 1990s had it right. He understood the threat. President Bush looked at the work that was done by President Bill Clinton and, after 9/11 had the opportunity to look through it through the lens of 9/11, and decided it was necessary to take a much stronger position and a much stronger role than what had ever been contemplated before, although even early in 2001, before 9/11, President Bush had indicated that it was time to take a look at our strategy and see if we should be more aggressive.

It was not only the President, but Members of Congress identified this threat. People are looking at people and saying, why did we not do this or that? Here are some quotes from the other body:

"If Saddam Hussein had nothing to hide, why would he have gone to such lengths to prevent the U.N. inspectors from doing their job? There is no doubt that since 1991 Saddam Hussein has squandered his country's resources to

maintain his capacity to produce and stockpile chemical and biological weapons. If we bomb Iraq again, he would be right back at it, claiming victory for standing up to the U.S., but no longer under the watchful eye of UNSCOM's cameras."

Another statement in 1998 from a colleague in the other body: "Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction programs and the means to deliver them are a menace to international peace and security. They pose a threat to Iraq's neighbors, to U.S. forces in the Gulf region, to the world's energy supplies and to the integrity and credibility of the United Nations Security Council." 1998.

Another quote from the other body: "We are here today to affirm that we and the American people stand with the President and the international community in an effort to end Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs and preserve our vital international interests."

The rules of the House prohibit me from mentioning the names of those individuals who made those quotes, but it is very interesting to see exactly who they are and the clarity with which they identify the threat Saddam Hussein and others posed to the United States.

Bill Clinton, February 18: "In this century we learned through harsh experience that the only answer to aggression and illegal behavior is firmness, determination and, when necessary, action. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now; a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed."

Here is an interesting quote. A critic of the President, a critic of the first President George Bush. It seems some people are never happy. I believe this is a quote from the candidate at that time for Vice President, Mr. Al Gore. This is where Vice President Gore, Senator Gore at that time, was talking about Saddam Hussein: "He had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly and Bush looked the other way. He had already conducted extensive terrorism activities and Bush looked the other way. He was already deeply involved in the effort to acquire nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; and Bush knew it, but he looked the other way. Well, in my view, the Bush administration was acting in a manner directly opposite to what you would expect with all of the evidence it had available to it at the time. Saddam Hussein's nature and intentions were perfectly visible." Were perfectly visible.

You wonder if you went through this quote and used it shortly after 9/11, you could have written it something like this: President Clinton and Al Gore knew that al Qaeda had already launched attacks against the World

Trade Center in 1993, but the Clinton Administration looked the other way.

Al Qaeda and terrorist organizations had already attacked our embassies in Africa, but the Clinton Administration looked the other way.

Al Qaeda or terrorist organizations were deeply involved in the effort to attack our barracks in Saudi Arabia. The Clinton Administration knew it, but they looked the other way.

They knew that al Qaeda or terrorist organizations were involved in the attack on the USS *Cole*, but they looked the other way.

Al Qaeda, bin Laden, their intentions were perfectly clear, but can it be said that the Clinton administration just looked the other way? I am not sure that that is a fair characterization.

As I said, the attacks on 9/11 were a surprise. But if you take the language that was used against then-President George Bush in 1992 and apply it shortly after 9/11 to what happened during the 1990s and the statements that were made and the inconsistencies, you wonder why there was not more action taken.

You have heard the quotes from various Members in the other body. You have heard the quotes of then-President Bill Clinton, of candidate Al Gore.

Madeleine Albright, November 16, 1997: "Hussein's weapons will not discriminate if and when they are used, and therefore it is important for the region to understand he is a threat. Our adversaries are unlikely to avoid," and here she is talking about understanding the threat of terrorism, "our adversaries are likely to avoid traditional battlefield situations because there American dominance is well established. We must be concerned instead of weapons of mass destruction and by the cowardly instruments of sabotage and hidden bombs. These unconventional threats endanger not only our Armed Forces, but all Americans and America's friends everywhere."

Here is a very clear statement. Again, some folks are trying to rewrite history saying everything was done during the 1990s. I am not sure it was. We will talk about that a little more. They are also saying the strategy to eliminate Saddam Hussein was recent, that it was not policy of the United States.

May 23, remarks by Vice President Gore: "Despite our swift victory and our effort since the Gulf War, there is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction."

People talk about the intelligence being cooked up. The intelligence maybe, and we know, was not everything we wanted it to be; but it was not cooked up. "Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction. You know as well as I do," what a statement, "you know as well as I do that as long as Saddam Hussein stays in power, there can be no comprehensive peace for the people of Israel or the people of the Middle East." This is

Vice President Gore, May 23, the year 2000.

□ 2030

They hear us talking about what the policy was, and I think it was established a couple of years earlier. But here is what the then Vice President says about the policy of the Clinton administration. We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein marginalized? That is not the word that is used. Contained? No. Reformed? No. We have made it clear, that is, the Clinton administration has made it clear, that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone. That was the policy of the United States prior to a new administration coming into office, prior to 9/11, because it was stated during the Clinton administration.

It goes on: We have maintained sanctions in the face of rising criticism while improving the Oil For Food program to help the Iraqi people directly. And just as a sidebar, while improving the Oil For Food program, we found out now, as the details have come back, that that was one of the greatest rip-offs ever. It was used to fund weapons acquisition, it was used to fund palaces and to build runways in the middle of nowhere in Iraq.

Going on with this quote: We have used force when necessary, and that has been frequently, and we will not let up in our efforts. We will not let up. We will not let up in our efforts to free Iraq from Saddam's rule. Should he think of challenging us, I would strongly advise against it. As a Senator, I voted for the use of force. As Vice President, I supported the use of force. If entrusted with the presidency, my resolve will never waiver.

Madam Speaker, the statements go on. Those are the statements in the 1990s. What about in 2002?

Again, some of my colleagues, and here is a quote from the presumed Democratic nominee for President: I believe the record of Saddam Hussein's ruthless, reckless breach of international values and standards of behavior, which is at the core of the cease-fire agreement, with no reach, no stretch is cause enough, is cause enough for the world community to hold him accountable by use of force, if necessary. Senator JOHN KERRY, October 9, 2002.

Here is another quote from one of his colleagues: But that isn't just a future threat. Saddam's existing biological and chemical weapons capabilities pose real threats to America today, tomorrow. Saddam has used chemical weapons before, both against Iraq's enemies and against his own people. He is working to develop delivery systems like missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles that could bring these deadly weapons against U.S. forces and U.S. facilities in the Middle East. He could make these weapons available to many terrorist groups, third parties which have contact with his government. Those groups in turn could bring those weap-

ons into the United States and unleash a devastating attack against our citizens. I fear that greatly.

Madam Speaker, it is pretty amazing, the unanimity between various sides of the aisle, the executive and the legislative branches, as to the threat posed by terrorism in the 1990s and the characterization and the threats posed by Saddam Hussein.

Here is another quote: As the attacks of September 11 demonstrated, the immense destructiveness of modern technology means we can no longer afford to wait around for a smoking gun. I do believe Iraq poses an imminent threat. I also believe that, after September 11, that question is increasingly outdated. It is in the nature of these weapons that he has and the way they are targeted against civilian populations that documented capability and demonstrated intent may be the only warning we get. To insist on further evidence could put some of our fellow Americans at risk. Can we afford to take that chance? I do not think we can.

That was the unanimity that we saw in 2002, it was the unanimity that we saw in the late 1990s, and over the last 4 to 6 weeks, folks have been trying to rewrite history in saying, no, no, I was not there. That is not where I was in 1990. That is not where I was in 1998. That is not where I was in 2002. As a matter of fact, the only person that has messed up in this whole thing is the current administration. And that is utterly false. There was a consensus, and what is now happening, and what I am concerned about is that when we are at war, and that is where I think we are, we are a nation at war.

Madam Speaker, I see my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has joined me, and I yield to him.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, first of all, I was watching the gentleman on television and I agreed with so much of what he said, in fact, everything that the gentleman said. But one of the things that concerns me is, while I was watching the gentleman on television, I was also watching CNN and Fox and watching the news reports on what happened in Fallujah in Iraq today. And some of the people who have been commenting on what happened have said, we really out to re-evaluate, we ought to pull our troops out, and they are talking in a way that will give aid and comfort to the enemies of the free world, not just the United States, but the free world, and that concerns me a great deal.

President Bush is doing the right thing, as the gentleman has stated, in fighting this war against terror and terrorism and terrorists. This is a world war. And the American people and my colleagues and the media need to realize, this is a world war not unlike what we faced in World War I, World War II and so forth. The difference is it is a guerilla-type war

being fought by fanatics who use people as bombs, who blow up innocent civilians and kill people, and they are not going to go away.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining me, because I wanted to talk about exactly that, and I feel fine going there.

Because, as the gentleman may remember, a couple of weeks ago, maybe a couple of months ago, we got this Dear Colleague memo talking about the new strategy, and I would just highlight it tonight. Because what we saw today, and it is tragic, the loss of American lives, the loss of the foreign civilians in Iraq and what they did with the bodies. But we should have known. Again that phrase, "we should have known."

Because here is what Zarkawi said. "Someone may say that in this matter we are being hasty," remember, this is their document outlining the strategy of the terrorists against our forces and against the forces that want to move forward in Iraq, "that we are being hasty and rash in leading the Islamic nation into a battle for which it is not ready, a battle that will be revolting," I mean the acts of today, dragging the bodies and hanging the bodies is revolting, "will be revolting and in which blood will be spilled. This is exactly what we want, since right and wrong no longer have any place in our current situation."

He predicted. This is exactly, what we see today is exactly the strategy, because they believe that that is the way that they can beat us, if they are revolting, spill blood, and right and wrong makes absolutely no difference.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, they saw what happened in Somalia when Black Hawk Down happened, and the previous administration did exactly what they wanted them to do, and that was to pull out.

Now, that was an encouragement, I believe, to the terrorists around the world at that point. Now we are in a world war against them. The President has made a commitment to free the world from terrorism and to protect the American citizens against another attack like 9/11.

If we want to encourage the terrorists, and I say this to my colleagues and to the news media and everybody else, if we want to encourage the terrorists, what we need to do is pull out and give them the green light to continue to use this kind of terrorist tactic to dissuade the free world from fighting against this terrorist activity and we are going to let them have the run of the field. That is something that we cannot do, we must not do. This is a war that the free world and the United States cannot lose.

Toward that end, regarding Fallujah and what happened in the last couple of days and the terrorist attacks in Iraq, what we need to do, and I would say this if the President were here tonight, what we need to do is let our troops go

in there and go house to house and take those weapons away to pacify that area. And anyone who has a gun, arrest them. And anyone who uses weapons in the commission of a terrorist attack or a crime, arrest them, get them out of there, and let the people know over there that we are going to do what is necessary to free them from the terrorist influence. And if we do not do that, then we are going to continue to encourage them.

So I would say to the President if he were listening tonight, and he may very well be or his advisors, let us let our troops go in there and pacify that area. Let us send a very strong signal to the terrorists and their affiliates over there that we are not going to stand still and let American citizens be killed or let American military personnel be killed.

It is extremely important that this signal be sent and sent now, because if we start listening to the liberals and the media who say, pull in our horns, let us start regressing and getting out of there, then what is going to happen is there is going to be a green light to the terrorists and we are going to have a hell of a problem.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman and I have probably both talked to a lot of our soldiers from our districts who have been in Iraq.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And the gentleman has been to Iraq, and so have I.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, on three different occasions.

It was interesting, I talked to one of my soldiers today. He was back in a small town in my community of New Era, Michigan. He just came home after just about a full year in Iraq. He told me what was going on and what the highlights were. He told me that he had been sent into a small community of 15,000 people, I think right near Kirkuk, and I said, hey, you kind of acted as mayor, because he was the governing authority. We know the strategy. We send our troops in, and they are not always fighting. He said, that is exactly what I had the opportunity to do. He said, we rebuilt that community from nothing. And he said, the people are thrilled that we are there; and they are looking for us to leave, because they want their country back.

Then we had a very good dialogue back and forth.

Then I did ask him, I said, okay, you have your Congressman on the phone. You are going back. You are going to be in the country for a couple of more weeks, but you are leaving west Michigan later on this week, and in a couple of weeks you will be back in Italy. I asked him, I said, you have your Congressman on the phone. What do you want to tell your Congressman?

He said, you know, can you do anything about the news media?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Because he said, when we were in Iraq, he said, we could

get CNN. He said, we finally turned it off, because what we saw on CNN had absolutely no relationship to what we were seeing in Iraq.

The gentleman from Indiana and I are not denying that these five Americans died today. That happened, and it is tragic, and it is sad. We are not denying that the four foreigners and the rioting and the mob scene in Fallujah, that happened. But, at the same time, in much of Iraq today, and the soldier quoted to me. He said, I think 98 percent of the people are there with us, and they are working with us, and they never get any coverage.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, when I watched the media a while ago, they showed the people demonstrating in Fallujah and the cars burning and the people waving the victory sign and everything. I was there. The gentleman was there. That is the minority of the people. And the media continues to focus on that, instead of the things that are being accomplished; and that really, really bothers me.

The other thing is, we have lost about 500 troops over there, and that is terrible. We do not want to see one young American maimed or die. But what happened in World War II is that 50 million people were killed worldwide because we let a war get out of hand. We have an opportunity right now to win this war on terrorism and to stop the terrorists and to send a very, very strong signal to them. It is a war that is going to go on for a long time. But if we do not send the right signals to them right now, they will be encouraged, in my opinion, and we will see more death take place that would not be necessary if we did the right things now.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman and I are in total agreement that if at this point in time we step back, the terrorists will have won. And that does not mean that the terrorists will go back to their home in Afghanistan or in the remote regions of Pakistan and say, well, chalk one up for the bad guys. They will say, let us now go back, and they will say, yes, it works.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes. Let us back them up in New York or someplace else.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let us go attack them in New York and what we will now have is we will now have a safe haven. We can plan out our attacks and we can work on our schedule and when it is appropriate to attack, we will attack. We will now have a safe haven to develop chemical weapons, biological weapons, and it is kind of like that is one direction, backing off.

That is not where we can go. We need these folks to wake up every morning and the first thing that they have to fear is that an American helicopter or American Special Ops force is going to come through their door.

□ 2045

Or that a missile is going to come from somewhere up in the sky from a

Predator, and they are never going to see it coming.

We saw that a war on terrorism can be won. I mean, who would have thought that our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), would address the General People's Congress of Libya? Who would have thought that 3 months ago? I think that happened within the last 4 years that our colleague was over there.

I was in Libya about four or five weeks ago. I think within the last month we have picked up, what, 500 tons of mustard gas and chemicals and equipment. Who would have thought that that amount of progress could have been made in that short time? This is a win for the good guys.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman makes a very good point. That is the kind of thing that the media should focus on. Here is a terrorist state, a known terrorist state that has said, okay, we are going to reject terrorism. And the reason was because they saw what we did in Iraq and Afghanistan. We sent a very strong signal.

We have had 500 troops die there in Iraq. I do not want one of those troops to have died in vain. They sent a very strong signal around the world. If the media continues on the path, and I am not talking about all the media now, but if the more liberal media continues on the path that it is on saying why should we not bring our troops home, why are we letting these sorts of things happen, they send a signal, as my colleague said before, to the terrorists that this sort of thing is working. That should not be the signal we send.

It was not the signal we sent in World War I or World War II. We should not send it now. Because this is a world war that the United States and the free world cannot afford to lose. And we cannot afford to send signals that encourage the terrorist network.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, maybe my colleague heard the quote that I read from candidate for Vice President Al Gore talking about the first Bush administration where he said, "He had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly. Bush looked the other way. He had already conducted extensive terrorism activities and Bush had looked the other way." Can one imagine what would happen if we pulled out of Iraq and pulled out of the war on terrorism and the next terrorist attack occurred and somebody would come to us and say excuse me, they attacked the World Trade Centers, you looked the other way. They attacked our barracks, you looked the other way. They attacked the Cole, you looked the other way. They attacked our embassies, you looked the other way. They attacked the Trade Centers a second time and took them down, they attacked the Pentagon and you guys looked the other way. What were you guys thinking?

I think that we were all in this together. We recognized the risk during the 1990s; and Congress and the executive branch, I think, did not take enough direct action. And so we can go back. But I think the criticism should be why did America not act earlier against bin Laden and against these threats in a more decisive way? Because the pieces were out there that said these folks are a threat, and it is only a matter of time before they try something big in the United States. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that back in the mid-90s we knew from intelligence reports that there were terrorist training camps in and around Khartoum in the Sudan. We knew that. We knew Usama bin Laden was in Khartoum, and we knew of the terrorist attacks like the ones that my colleague cited a few minutes ago; and we really did not go after him, although we should have at that time.

Now, I am not saying there is not enough blame to go around. Any time you get into a military conflict, especially one this extensive, there are going to be mistakes made. But the one mistake that has not been made is by our President. He has done the right thing in taking the mantle of leadership and moving forward. He is going after the terrorists wherever they hide in Afghanistan, in Iraq, wherever they are. And I commend him for that.

And this country, and the media in particular, if they are paying any attention tonight, the media in particular ought to think about the ramifications of trying to get us to pull in our horns when we are fighting a war against terrorism. They should be supporting the effort to rid the world of terrorists and the terrorist network instead of pointing out all the deficiencies.

We are in a war against terrorism, one we cannot afford to lose. We have a man at the helm right now who is doing the right things. And, by golly, he ought to be supported not just by my colleague and me, but by the entire country and, in particular, those in the media because they have such a tremendous influence on public policy.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am not looking for the media to support the President, it might be nice, or to support the country or to support the direction or support our troops. It would just be nice if they presented a balanced approach, fair and balanced approach to what needs to get done.

And it is why when I go home it is good to take a look at the local papers because the local papers will cover the stories of our soldiers that come home. The soldier that I talked to today said he has been in Iraq for 11, 12 months. He is home with his family for the first time. One would think he would say, man, I am just going to sit back on the couch and I am going to vegetate and just enjoy this. He is going to the

schools, he is going all over his community telling them about what he did and what America did in Iraq. He is proud of it. He says, I am doing it because nobody else is. We are not getting any help from the media. I am going out and I am telling the story because I was there.

And has my colleague been to Iraq?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, yes, I was there about 3 weeks ago.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have looked into the eyes of the Iraqi people. We have shaken their hands. We have heard them speak. We have seen the sincerity. I always say this is not easy. And there are going to be other ugly days and other ugly events. We are not going to fix this all in one day. We are not going to fix it in 24 months. This takes work. These people are experimenting with a free press, representative government, free markets. They are doing this for the first time after 30 years of a brutal regime.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield. When I was over there, I am sure my colleague found the same thing, they had found 400,000 people in unmarked graves. They estimated between 1 and 1.3 million people that are unaccounted for. They were putting people in wood chipper, they were raping women. It was horrible what was going on, the torture and everything.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, one point, he is right, it is going to be somewhere over a million people probably, in a country of 27 million. That means 4 percent of the folks in that country were brutally murdered. In our country that would be about 11, 12 million people.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, if we did not do anything but free that country, that would be a great thing. But what we have done is we have sent a very strong signal to the terrorist network al Qaeda, the Taliban, the Baath Party in Iraq, and the terrorists around the world; and what bothers me now is because the media is focusing only on the negatives and not the positives, not on what we have accomplished but what we have not yet accomplished and, I believe, maybe inadvertently, they are giving aid and comfort to the enemy, the terrorist network, and that is something they should not do.

They may not agree with everything President Bush has done, but they have to admit that we have gotten rid of Saddam Hussein. We are on the heels of Usama bin Laden. We have knocked out an awful lot of the terrorist network, and there have been no more attacks on the United States of America. That does not mean we will not have them. But there have been no more attacks. That is because of President Bush, homeland security, and Tom Ridge, and because they are doing the right things. I just wish the media would focus on them.

I normally do not come down here and vent my spleen like this. I try to be a little bit more moderate, if one wants to say that; but right now I am very, very angry because all we are seeing on the screen right now is should we be there, should we not be pulling out, should we be pulling in our horns.

The one thing we must not do, and I am speaking to the media in particular right now, is we must not send the message that we are going to withdraw or cave in this war against terrorism. It is essential that we are victorious. No matter how long it takes, we have to be victorious. Just like in World War I and in World War II, we have to win this war, otherwise we are going to suffer terrorist threats and terrorist attacks for many, many, many years to come.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that is one of the things that we as a Nation need to recognize. I was on a TV program earlier today and someone asked me what are you guys accomplishing, or who is responsible. I said, well, obviously, there is plenty of blame to go around. But not only is it the executive branch, and by executive branch I mean generic, not this President, because I agree with my colleague, this President has shown the leadership that is necessary to fight this war on terrorism, not only is there blame to go around in Congress, but there is also a certain responsibility of the American people.

Because our actions sometimes are too often guided by public opinion. And for folks to say, well, you should have done more in 1998 or you should have done more in 2001, the real question is do we really think that the American people would have embraced it.

We know that even after 2001 some of them have been restrained in their support or been openly hostile to going after al Qaeda and going after bin Laden and going into Afghanistan.

The other thing is my colleague and I both probably know that the quickest ticket to unemployment in Congress is to show any interest in foreign affairs. One goes on a trip and learns more about the Middle East or whatever, and it is, oh, you do not care about us back home anymore. The American people bear some of that responsibility because we are the world's sole superpower economically and politically and militarily. That carries an awesome responsibility with it. I think it is one of the great cases for federalism.

This place should focus on national security. It should focus on international trade agreements and our relationships with the rest of the world. Many other issues ought to be dealt with on a State and local level. We have a tremendous responsibility to address these issues.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to say something about what my colleague said a moment ago. He was talking about, in essence, we cannot look back and talk

about the shortcomings. We have to look forward and say what are we doing now to deal with the problem; what are we going to do with it in the future.

Bobby Jones, one of the greatest golfers of all time, I will use this as an analogy, he said, You play the ball where it lies. When he was hurt, when he was dying and was physically impaired, people said, do you not feel bad about that? He said, That is life. You play the ball where it lies.

What we have to do now is realize where we are in this world and what it is all about. And there is a war against the terrorists that is in progress, and it is a war we cannot lose. So we have to start here and go forward. And the President has already started that ball moving in the right direction by taking on the terrorists, taking on Saddam Hussein, trying to make sure there are no weapons of mass destruction that are going to be used against the Middle East or the United States or the rest of the world. I think we are on the right track.

The thing we have to do now is make sure we keep the American people with us in this war against terrorism, and that is why the media is so important. They can play a very valuable role in making sure that the facts are out there, not opinion; but the facts are out there on what we have accomplished and where we are going.

As my colleague said, it does not have to be pro-Bush or against Bush, it just has to be fair reporting. If they report the progress that is being made and how the war is progressing and what we are winning instead of just the negatives, I am sure that everything will come out all right.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I love the analogy of play the ball where it lies because that is exactly what President Bush did after 9/11. He went back and took a look at what capabilities we had and the threats that were out there, but never went back to try to assess blame on something that happened 5 or 6 years ago or the Deutsch Doctrine that gutted our human intelligence. When we should have built intelligence up in the mid-1990s, it was gutted. That is exactly what happened when we get to 2001 and here we are in 2004 and we would like to have a human intelligence capability, we say, God, where did it go? We scrubbed it because we got rid of all the bad guys in 1995 and 1996 who spied for us. And one can say, well, when we are dealing with a terrorist organization, the only people that are in terrorist organizations are bad folks to begin with.

But that is not where the President was. He took a look at 9/11, took a look at where we were strategically, militarily, and what we needed to get done, and went forward, never trying to pin blame anywhere but just said, hey, I am playing it where it lies.

We will look at how it got here to make sure it does not happen again in the future, but I am not going back and

say that guy took a bad swing or he sliced it or whatever; I am going to take it and move it forward. Because, again, I think in some ways Americans are getting a little lackadaisical. There is a real threat out there. And this President and this administration, and I hope Congress in a bipartisan way, stay focused on the threat that is out there and put in place a strategy to fix it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. One of the things that was reported on briefly but should have been reported on in more detail was after 9/11 and the World Trade Center was taken down by the planes, and the Pentagon was attacked, and they were going to attack the Capitol had it not been for those heroic people in Pennsylvania that died, but the fact of the matter is planes coming from Paris, France, and from Europe were stopped from coming over here because they found out through intelligence gathering that they had potential terrorists on those planes that were going to make them into bombs to blow up more buildings in the United States.

□ 2100

So our intelligence-gathering capability has increased dramatically since President Bush took office and since Tom Ridge took over homeland security.

Things are getting better, and we are stopping terrorist attacks, but those are the things that ought to be reported upon, the things that we have stopped from happening in the United States to protect the American people, instead of dwelling just on negatives. If we just do that, I would be much, much happier.

I just want to say to my colleague, because I am going to leave the stage back to him, I want to thank you very, very much for taking this time. We ought to have a whole host of our colleagues down here talking about this tonight, but you are the guy that did it, and I want to thank you for carrying the mantle of leadership tonight. You are to be congratulated.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague; and I hope he recovers his voice soon. We would miss it if he lost his voice.

There is a lot of stuff that has happened in what we have talked about. There are a couple of other documents that I just want to talk about, and we have talked a little bit about rewriting history.

There was some testimony just from the last couple of days in front of the joint inquiry; and it really I think in many ways, from my perspective, boils down to partisan politics, partisan politics at its worst. Because national security is too important an issue to take down into the partisan battleground, and it is one of the very positive things about serving on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

There have been a couple of things in the last few weeks that have been disappointing, but, by and large, the commitment by members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is to do their work aggressively, effectively, but to leave the partisan labels at the door and to recognize that the issues that we are working on are too important to drag down into a short-term, partisan, political game because, at the end, the country loses.

Here is what Dick Clarke said. The Bush administration decided in late January to do two things: one, vigorously pursue the existing policy, including all of the lethal covert action findings. The point is, while this big review was going on, the lethal findings were still in effect. The second thing the administration decided to do was to initiate a process to look at those issues which had been on the table for a couple of years and get them decided, and that is in August of 2002.

In the spring of 2001, the Bush administration began to change Pakistani policy by a dialogue that said we would be willing to lift sanctions. So we began to offer carrots which made it possible for Pakistanis I think to begin to think that they could go down another path, which was to join us and break away from the Taliban. So that is really how it started.

A few minutes ago, we talked about the victory and the progress we have made in Libya. Back in 2001, the Bush administration, before 9/11, was talking about changing the policy in Pakistan to forge that partnership which then and now has enabled us. I met with the head of the Pakistani intelligence agency just a few weeks ago, right when they were sending a number of troops into their tribal areas, and they had lost a number of Pakistani troops. But who would have thought maybe even 2 or 3 years ago that by 2004 that the Pakistanis would not only be cooperating in our war on terrorism but they would be sending their own troops into these regions to find al Qaeda, to find the leadership of al Qaeda and to help us take out the Taliban and al Qaeda elements that were seeking refuge in Pakistan.

Again, I had a question today about when Condoleezza Rice and the President and this administration had really provided unprecedented support for the subcommittee that I served on in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that did a review almost directly after 9/11, provided full support and access to the joint House-Senate inquiry and now to the independent Commission. This is a statement that the Commission made on March 30.

"The Commission welcomes the decision of the President and the Vice-President to meet in one joint private session with all 10 commissioners.

"We also commend the President for his decision to accept the Commission's request for public testimony, under oath, by the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Dr. Condoleezza Rice."

Remember, Dr. Rice had already testified to this Commission for 4 hours in private session.

"These decisions represent a significant contribution by the President to the work of the Commission, consistent with our mandate to 'provide a full and complete accounting' of the terrorist attacks of September 11.

"The President has consistently stated a policy of strong support for the Commission and instructed the executive branch to provide unprecedented extraordinary access to the Commission."

This is what the Commission said. "The President has consistently stated a policy of strong support for the Commission and instructed the executive branch to provide unprecedented and extraordinary access to the Commission. His decisions today reflect that policy of strong support, and we welcome them."

The Commission recognizes what is going on and that the President's support has been unprecedented, and we have got to remember that this is not looking back in history and saying, well, what happened during the war on terrorism. We are still fully engaged in the war on terrorism. We are still in the middle of fighting that war, and what is unprecedented about this President's cooperation is that there have already been I think 20 witnesses from the executive branch in front of the Commission.

Now Dr. Condoleezza Rice has already testified in private, will now testify in public, but the public nature of this reviewing the decision-making process at the very time we are still conducting the war, not when it is done, but at the very time, digging into the inner reaches of an administration and asking about how they are conducting policy, how they are making decisions, and it is one thing to do it in private. It is another to do it fully in public.

Someone asked me earlier this week and said in some ways I think the administration has gone almost too far. We are at war and the information is provided in private or secret session to those folks who are entrusted to make the decisions and the recommendations that enable this country to move forward responsibly, aggressively and effectively, but I sometimes worry that there are some in the world today who take comfort and believe that they are being successful in their efforts to defeat us in this war on terrorism when they see the partisanship that we sometimes are engaged in. This issue is too big to move down into partisanship.

The last comment that I wanted to make is today I talked with one of our soldiers today who was back from Iraq. I have met with the family of one of our soldiers who was killed in Iraq. I have met with the family of one of our soldiers who was very badly wounded in an incident. In each of those cases, they have said, make sure that we win

this war on terrorism, that we dedicate the resources to this war on terrorism. But they also said, do not forget the sacrifices of the families that have been asked to sacrifice, the families that have seen a son and husband gone for a year, the family that has seen a father and a husband and a son killed on a battlefield in Iraq and the family of the son and the husband of a soldier who has been badly wounded and will live with that for the rest of his life.

But I think we need to remember all of these folks and the troops that are still serving over there, and I hope that we as a Nation, that we as a Congress, continue to remember these families and these individuals in our prayers.

THE 9/11 COMMISSION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, this evening I want to discuss the serious accusations that former White House counterterrorism chief Richard Clarke has leveled at President Bush over the last week. I would also like to discuss my concern over the administration's attempts, attempts that have now been joined by several congressional Republicans, to draw attention away from the serious accusations by instead viciously attacking the messenger; and, finally, I come to the floor to highlight inconsistencies in the statements that Condoleezza Rice has made over the last week, inconsistencies that will undoubtedly be addressed when she testifies as early as next week under oath in front of the 9/11 Commission.

Madam Speaker, it is nice to see that after months of stalling the Bush administration has finally made an agreement with the 9/11 Commission to have the President, Vice President and National Security Adviser all appear before the entire 9/11 Commission. The announcement was a complete retreat from the Bush administration's previous belief that Condoleezza Rice should not testify in public.

Last evening, the President went before reporters and said that he had ordered this level of cooperation because, and I quote President Bush here, I consider it necessary to gaining a complete picture of the months and years that preceded the murder of our fellow citizens on September 11, 2001.

Madam Speaker, I think it is great that the Bush administration finally caved in and will allow Condoleezza Rice to testify, but it is somewhat disingenuous for the President to say that he has cooperated with the Commission in the past. In fact, President Bush has stalled the Commission for months on many of their requests.

Up until yesterday, the President said that he would only testify before the Commission's chair and vice chair;

and now President Bush and Vice President CHENEY will testify together but not under oath and only one member of the Commission will be allowed to take notes. Allowing one person in the room to take notes, in my opinion, is no way to fully document critical testimony from the President and the Vice President, and I am also interested in why the President and the Vice President insist on testifying together.

So, Mr. President, thank you for finally caving in to political pressure and allowing Condoleezza Rice to testify, but do not try to spin your way out of this by making it appear that you have been cooperating with the 9/11 Commission from the very beginning, because that is simply not the case.

By delaying, the Bush administration has made it extremely difficult for the 9/11 Commission to finish its work in a timely fashion, and the Commission should not be expected to complete its work until it has heard from all the principals involved in the events leading up to and coming after 9/11.

Public testimony from Condoleezza Rice is perhaps even more important now that we have heard from Richard Clarke, the President's former top counterterrorism adviser. Last week, Richard Clarke raised eyebrows all over the Nation when he appeared on 60 Minutes, released a book critical of the Bush administration's policy on fighting terrorism, and then testified before the 9/11 Commission where he personally apologized to the victims' families and told them that they had failed them or that he had failed them.

Richard Clarke raises some serious questions, questions that Condoleezza Rice should attempt to answer before the 9/11 Commission, and I would like to mention some of those questions, Madam Speaker.

Question number one: Did the Bush administration, as Richard Clarke claims, and I quote, ignore terrorism for months when maybe we could have done something to stop 9/11? You do not have to take Richard Clarke's word for it. President Bush bluntly acknowledged as much during an interview with Bob Woodward for Woodward's book titled *Bush At War*.

Despite repeated warnings of an imminent al Qaeda attack before 9/11 President Bush admitted to Woodward, and I quote again, I did not feel the sense of urgency. That is what the President said. If he did not realize the sense of urgency, one has to really wonder what kind of advice he was receiving from his National Security Adviser and others.

According to Richard Clarke, he tried repeatedly to get the administration to pay serious attention to the issue of terrorism.

On January 24, 2001, just days after President Bush took the oath of office, Richard Clarke wrote an urgent memo to Condoleezza Rice, asking for an urgent Cabinet-level meeting to deal with an impending al Qaeda attack.

Clarke claims this request was never acted upon. Three months later, in place of a Cabinet-level meeting, Richard Clarke was finally able to schedule a meeting with Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz. Clarke said he started the meeting by stating to the Deputy Secretary of Defense that we needed to deal with bin Laden.

□ 2115

And Wolfowitz's response? "No, no, no, we don't have to deal with al Qaeda. Why are we talking about that little guy? We have to talk about Iraqi terrorism against the United States." That's what Wolfowitz said.

Again, meetings like this are critical because people like Wolfowitz, CHENEY, Rumsfeld and Rice were the very people advising the President. If Wolfowitz was describing Osama bin Laden as a little guy to Richard Clarke, one has to assume he was making the same sorts of comments to his boss, Donald Rumsfeld.

Clarke could not believe Wolfowitz's characterization of bin Laden as a little guy. Clarke then responded to Wolfowitz, and again I quote, "Paul, there hasn't been any Iraqi terrorism against the United States in 8 years." Clarke turned to the Deputy Director of the CIA, who agreed with his assessment. Clarke's statements contradict those of the National Security Adviser.

On Sunday night, in an interview on "60 Minutes," Condoleezza Rice said, "The administration took seriously the threat of terrorism before 9/11," in stark contrast to the very comments of her boss, President Bush. And I would like to see Rice's response to a report in *Newsweek* magazine that the administration was trying to deemphasize terrorism as an overall priority. As proof, the report pointed to the fact that only two out of a hundred national security meetings the administration held before 9/11 addressed the terrorist threat.

I look forward to hearing if the National Security Adviser thinks two meetings on the issue of terrorism shows a true dedication on the administration's part to fighting terrorism and to taking terrorist threats seriously.

The National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, also stated during her interview on "60 Minutes," and I quote again, "I don't know that a sense of urgency any greater than the one we had would have caused us to do anything differently. I don't know how we could have done more. I would like very much to know what more we could have done."

The salient answer to this question, Madam Speaker, is a lot more could have been done. First, the administration could have held more than two national security meetings on the issue. Based on the major intelligence spike in the summer of 2001, the administration could have held more meetings with top officials from the CIA and the FBI to make sure the agencies were sharing information.

Earlier this week, 9/11 commissioner Jamie Gorelick said that the lack of focus and meetings meant agencies were not talking to each other and key evidence was overlooked.

Richard Clarke is also very critical of the administration's obsession with Saddam Hussein. Again in her interview on "60 Minutes," Rice claimed that Iraq was put aside immediately after 9/11. But Rice's own claims were refuted, this time by a *Washington Post* report stating that 6 days after the 9/11 attacks, the President signed a 3-page document directing the Pentagon to begin planning military options for an invasion of Iraq.

Furthermore, CBS News reported in 2002 that 5 hours after the 9/11 attacks, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld was telling his aids to come up with plans for striking Iraq. This is also consistent with Clarke's own statements in which he says that "Rumsfeld told him on September 11 that they needed to bomb Iraq." Clarke writes in his book that, "On September 12, he went home for a brief period of time to eat and take a shower and return to the White House." Clarke writes, and I quote, "I expected to go back to a round of meetings examining what the next attacks could be, what our vulnerabilities were. Instead, I walked into a series of discussions about Iraq. At first, I was incredulous we were talking about something other than getting al Qaeda. Then I realized, with almost a sharp physical pain, that Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz were going to try to take advantage of this national tragedy to promote their agenda on Iraq. Clearly, the administration continued to have its eyes set on going to war with Iraq."

Now, Madam Speaker, I ask: Was the war on terrorism a convenient, yet flawed, justification for going to war against Iraq? That is what Richard Clarke believes. It is also supported by another former high-ranking Bush administration official, Paul O'Neill. The former Treasury Secretary stated in his book that "Vice President CHENEY strongly suggested U.S. intervention in Iraq well before the terrorist attacks of September 11." This is another question Condoleezza Rice should answer in front of the American people.

Madam Speaker, it is clear that President Bush's rationale for war against Iraq was flawed. The Bush administration used two things to justify war with Iraq: first, a connection between Iraq and al Qaeda; and, second, the idea that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction.

In addition to the new questions raised by Richard Clarke about the Iraq-al Qaeda link, experts have concluded that Iraq did not have weapons that posed an immediate threat to the United States. CIA Director George Tenet recently admitted that the intelligence agencies never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat. And former chief U.N. weapons inspector Hans Blix stated that the Bush administration made up its mind

that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and it was not interested in evidence to the contrary.

Madam Speaker, when the President signed the law creating the commission in November 2002, he urged the panel to, and I quote, "carefully examine all the evidence and follow all the facts wherever they lead." But, clearly, the Bush administration did not mean following it to the President's National Security Adviser. And while the administration charges the panel to follow the facts wherever they may lead, they and some congressional Republicans are attempting to minimize some of those possible facts by attacking the character of Richard Clarke.

Last week, the majority leader in the other Chamber implied that Richard Clarke had perjured himself either during his testimony before the 9/11 Commission last week or during his testimony before the Joint Congressional Intelligence Committee hearing in July 2002, because, according to Senator FRIST, he appears to have told two different stories. However, despite some pretty harsh words for Mr. Clarke, the Senate majority leader could not point to one specific example, but called for all of Clarke's testimony before the House Senate intelligence panel 2 years ago.

Now, this past Sunday, Clarke said he would support the declassification of his testimony before the joint intelligence panels if the administration also declassifies the National Security Adviser's testimony before the 9/11 Commission and the declassification of the January 25, 2001, memo that Clarke sent to Rice laying out a terrorism strategy, a strategy that was not approved until months later.

Madam Speaker, House Democrats really want a full accounting of the events leading up to the September 11 attacks, including the extent to which a preoccupation with Iraq affected efforts to deal with the threat posed by al Qaeda. It is nice to see the White House has finally stopped stonewalling the commission and now says that it will provide the public testimony the commission is requesting. But Americans need to be able to fully evaluate the decisions of government leaders, especially when it comes to the life and death decisions of war and peace.

Madam Speaker, there are others that I would like to yield my time to tonight; but I just wanted to say before we go on that I have been to the floor many times over the last few months talking about the Republican abuse of power and the Bush administration's abuse of power. Yesterday, there was an op-ed column in the New York Times by Paul Krugman that was entitled, "This Isn't America." And it kind of sums up my concern about the abuse of power.

I mention it tonight in the context of Richard Clarke and the 9/11 Commission and the National Security Adviser, but Krugman pretty much sums up how this abuse of power is rampant

with the Bush administration and the Republicans in Washington. And I am not going to read the whole thing, but I just wanted to read a couple of parts of it, where Krugman says, "Last week an opinion piece in the Israeli newspaper Haaretz about the killing of Sheik Ahmed Yassin, said, 'This isn't America; the government did not invent intelligence material nor exaggerate the description of the threat to justify their attack.' So even in Israel, George Bush's America has become a byword for deception and abuse of power. And the administration's reaction to Richard Clarke's 'Against All Enemies' provides more evidence that something is rotten in the State of our government."

Krugman goes on to say that not only in the case of Richard Clarke, but in many other cases there is abuse of power by the administration and the congressional Republicans: "A few examples: according to the Hill, Republican lawmakers threatened to cut off funds for the General Accounting Office unless it dropped its lawsuit against Dick Cheney. The Washington Post says Representative Michael Oxley told lobbyists that 'a congressional probe might ease if it replaced its Democratic lobbyist with a Republican.' Tom DeLay used the Homeland Security Department to track down Democrats trying to prevent redistricting in Texas. And Medicare is spending millions of dollars on misleading ads for the new drug benefit, ads that look like news reports and also serve as commercials for the Bush campaign."

Krugman ends and he says, and I quote, "Where will it end? In his new book, 'Worse Than Watergate,' John Dean of Watergate fame, says 'I've been watching all the elements fall into place for two possible political catastrophes; one that will take the air out of the Bush-Cheney balloon, and the other far more disconcerting that will take the air out of democracy.'"

The reason that many Democrats, including myself, come down here on a regular basis now to talk about the Republican abuse of power is exactly for the reason that John Dean quotes in his book, and that is we are very concerned about the future of democracy and where we are going with these kinds of abuses of power by the Bush administration and the Republican majority.

I see my colleague from California is here, and I probably took up too much, and so I want to yield to her.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for continuing to speak the truth, and for making sure that our country understands the type of abuses that are taking place here in Washington, D.C. I believe that democracy is at a crossroads, and I think the gentleman has made that very clear tonight. So I want to thank the gentleman for his continuing to speak truth to power, as we say.

Madam Speaker, let me also tonight thank the distinguished chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for his leadership on this and so many other issues as he continues to consistently attempt to wake up America.

We are here tonight, Madam Speaker, to talk about the Bush administration's systematically deceiving the American people. This administration has spun a web of deception that really enshrouds the truth and hides, mind you, reality. Specifically, I want to talk about the administration's foreign policy and how it has based a doctrine of preemptive strikes on a foundation that is really built on falsehoods, lies, and distortions.

But first let me just say it is especially telling and especially tragic that we are here tonight as we mourn nine new victims of this misguided war. Five soldiers and four contractors were killed today. Our thoughts and our prayers go out to their families and to all of those whose loved ones are still at risk.

We mourn these latest deaths as we speak out against the deliberate decisions and the deceptions that took this country to war. This administration did not tell the truth to Congress, to the American people, and to the world about the causes, the costs, and the consequences of the war in Iraq. The deceit started, mind you, well before the war did, and that is no accident. The web of deception was woven in order to create a reason for the war.

The administration told us time and time again that Iraq posed an immediate threat to the United States. In the President's State of the Union address, the Secretary of State's presentation to the United Nations, and in many other statements and speeches the administration told us that Iraq was developing nuclear weapons and it already had vast stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons. This was apparently all false.

President Bush said that Saddam Hussein was buying aluminum tubes and African uranium for nuclear weapons. This was false. Vice President CHENEY said we know, and this is a quote, "We know he has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons, and we believe he has in fact reconstituted nuclear weapons." This was false.

President Bush said, we gave them a chance to allow the inspectors in and they wouldn't let them in. This was false. As for the weapons of mass destruction, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, we know where they are. This was false. The administration time and time again tied Saddam Hussein to the terrorist attacks of September 11, and this was downright false.

These statements were, however, part of a larger pattern of distortion that included warping intelligence to fit the administration's vision of the world and then passing on that warped intelligence to the American people and to the world as a fact.

The administration also, mind you, disguised the cost of the war, which of course taxpayers are paying for. When economic adviser Larry Lindsey said in 2002 that war in Iraq could cost between \$100 billion and \$200 billion, well, he was right; but you know what, he was fired.

When asked about the possible consequences of the war, the administration presented a portrait of a country that would be uniformly grateful to its American invaders. This week's Nation says, and I quote, "The idiotic and arrogant statements by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and others that policing Iraq would be a simple matter that could be quickly cleaned up by all those flowers they were going to throw."

□ 2130

The many distortions, deceptions and omissions amounted to, as I was actually taught like many of us were taught as a child, lying. I was also taught that this is really wrong. This deception was clearly and deliberately escalated. The very impressive and thought-provoking report by the Carnegie Endowment For International Peace found a very dramatic shift in the fall of 2002 as the administration sought to rally support for its unnecessary war. Let me just read what the Carnegie Foundation indicates:

Administration officials systematically misrepresented the threat from Iraq's WMD and ballistic missile programs, beyond the intelligence failures noted above by, one, treating nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons as a single WMD threat. The conflation of three distinct threats, very different in the danger they pose, distorted the cost-benefit analysis of the war.

Secondly, insisting without evidence, yet treating as a given truth, that Saddam Hussein would give whatever WMD he possessed to terrorists.

Thirdly, routinely dropping caveats, probabilities, and expressions of uncertainty present in intelligence assessments from public statements.

Next, misrepresenting inspectors' findings in ways that turned threats from minor to dire.

The Carnegie Endowment For International Peace is a world-renowned institution. I suggest that if Members have not read this report, they should read it because, in fact, it lays out the facts, the reality and what actually went down prior to this war.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, has presented a comprehensive examination of the statements and misstatements by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Adviser. The gentleman from California has compiled a database of deception about alleged weapons of mass destruction, alleged ties to al Qaeda and the allegedly urgent threat to the United States posed

by Iraq. That database shows just how far-reaching these distortions were, and they do not stop with Iraq, and they do not stop with foreign policy. But let me just read a couple of the gentleman from California's quotes which have been recorded in this document:

One is from Vice President DICK CHENEY. He said, "We know he's got chemical and biological weapons." But, rather, the truth is the statement failed to acknowledge that the Defense Intelligence Agency's position was, "There is no reliable information on whether Iraq is producing and stockpiling chemical weapons or where Iraq has—or will—establish its chemical warfare agent production facilities."

President Bush: "We've also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical or biological weapons across broad areas. We are concerned that Iraq is exploring ways of using these UAVs for missions targeting the United States."

The explanation of this tale is this was misleading because it claimed that Iraq's UAVs were intended and able to spread chemical or biological weapons, including over the United States, but this failed and the President failed to mention that the United States Government agency most knowledgeable about UAVs and their potential applications, the Air Force's National Air and Space Intelligence Center, had the following view: "The U.S. Air Force does not agree that Iraq is developing UAVs primarily intended to be delivery platforms for chemical and biological agents."

Another President Bush quote: "We found the weapons of mass destruction. We found biological laboratories. You remember when Colin Powell stood up in front of the world, and he said, Iraq has got laboratories, mobile labs to build biological weapons. They're illegal. They're against the United Nations resolutions, and we've so far discovered two. And we'll find more weapons as time goes on. But for those who say we haven't found the banned manufacturing devices or banned weapons, they're wrong. We found them."

What this really was, according to the Defense Intelligence Agency, was that these trailers which the President said were to produce biological weapons did not disclose the fact that the engineers at the DIA examined the trailers and concluded that they were most likely to produce hydrogen for artillery weather balloons. That is what the DIA concluded.

We could go on and on tonight about this, but I think the public is beginning to get the picture.

Let us look at Haiti for a minute where the administration claimed it was defending democracy while in fact it was conspiring to undermine and to overthrow the duly elected President of Haiti. That is why we need an independent commission to investigate the

role of the administration in the overthrow of the Aristide government. That is also why we still need a truly independent commission to investigate the use and the misuse of intelligence in the war in Iraq.

Of course, the same deceptions permeate our domestic policies as well. Look at the administration's track record on its domestic policies.

Example. He said that his tax cuts for the rich would create jobs. Instead, we have seen 3 million jobs disappear in this country since President Bush took office. He said the vast majority of those tax cuts would go to those at the bottom end of the economic spectrum. Instead, the top 1 percent of earners reap over a third of the tax benefits by themselves. Only the top 1 percent. The President said that our schools will have greater resources to help meet the goals of Leave No Child Behind. But for the third year in a row the President's budget falls billions of dollars short of fully funding Leave No Child Behind.

The deficit. The President says our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-term, but the fact is that the 10-year deficit projection by the Congressional Budget Office, assuming extending the tax provisions, is \$4.7 trillion. In just 2 years, there has been an almost \$12 trillion swing in the deficit outlook. The \$5.6 trillion 10-year surplus projected when the President took office has been replaced by deficits as far as the eye can see. For 2004, the President's budget proposes a record deficit of \$521 billion, \$146 billion more than the 2003 deficit, which was also a historic record. Yet the President said on January 7, 2003, "Our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-term."

We have to really get our administration to begin to understand the value of telling the truth, because in both the domestic and foreign policies of this administration, this administration and the President has deceived the American people about their national security, their economy, their children's education and their future. We should be leading the world, not misleading it. That is exactly what we are doing.

Finally, let me just say one of the biggest farces which the President said and indicated he wanted to do was to unite the country. I believe that this country is more divided tonight than ever.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Chair would remind the Members not to refer to the President or the Vice President in terms that are personally offensive, such as accusations of deceit.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, may I respond?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I am referring to statements of fact and information which has been documented and quotes which have been published already.

I thank the Speaker for reminding us of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is reminded that Members may not read into debate extraneous material which would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

I know I have to yield to my other colleague from Maryland, but I just wanted to point out that again, going back to what I said before, and I was referencing this New York Times article about the future of democracy, in order for us to make fair and accurate decisions in the way we vote on the floor, whether it is to go to war in Iraq or it is to provide funding for various programs, we need to have accurate information. I think what the gentlewoman is pointing out is that, whether it is foreign policy or domestic policy, with the kind of deception that we are getting, we cannot rely on the information that is being provided by the administration because many times it is distorted or it is not accurate. That is, I think, the real problem here.

I voted against the war but many of our colleagues, both Democrats and Republican, voted for it because they relied on representations that were being made by the White House that there were weapons of mass destruction, that there was an imminent threat, so many of the things that she pointed out. So, ultimately, they made the wrong decision, many of whom now regret that decision, because they did not get accurate information. They relied on the White House to make a decision that was the wrong decision.

The whole point is that we cannot make the right decisions, we cannot figure out what to do here if we continue to get this inaccurate information from the White House. What ultimately is going to happen is we are not going to believe anything we get. We are just going to have to come find some other source and assume that whatever comes from the White House is not accurate and cannot be relied on. I think the gentlewoman pointed that out so many times.

Ms. LEE. I would just like to say, I think it is very important for us, as the leader of the free world, the greatest superpower in the world, to be credible, to be credible as we move forward in this 21st century in terms of how we view the world in terms of our strategic position, in terms of our quest to have a peaceful world, a secure world and in terms of our efforts to eliminate terrorism.

There is no way we should sweep under the rug the facts. The facts are here, they are published, we know what who said when. I hope that the American people understand that we come to this floor to try to present the facts

because oftentimes the media does not do that. We have it right here, and we are urging people to read what has been said over the last few years.

We have lost over 560 young men and women in the military. Their lives are lost, their families' lives are shattered as a result of this misinformation and this deceit which led us to war.

I believe it is our duty and our responsibility to put these facts out and to make sure that the American people know what was said, what was the basis for this war and what the outcome, unfortunately, has been.

Mr. PALLONE. I mentioned before about this op-ed with Krugman where he was quoting the Israeli newspaper Haaretz, a major publication in Israel. I just want to read that quote again in their editorial where they said, "This isn't America; the government did not invent intelligence material nor exaggerate the description of the threat to justify their attack."

We tend to think of this country and I have always felt it as the country that stands for what is right, what is just, what is honest, and to think that an Israeli newspaper is now saying, we're not like the government of the United States, we don't make up things, we don't lie, we don't exaggerate, as if that is the norm for us, is a pretty sad state of affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman for his vigilance and for consistently standing up for what is right.

I have often said that I would like to see my children and grandchildren have a better country, inherit a better country than the one that existed on January 18, 1951, when I was born.

I must say that when I listened to my colleagues speak and I look at the very subject that we are talking about tonight, I am very much concerned that they will not inherit a better country. As a matter of fact, the kinds of things that we are talking about tonight, where words of this administration are inaccurate, should give the entire American public chills, because they are the things that lead to the chipping away of this wonderful institution that we call a democracy.

So I thank the gentleman for standing up and I thank all of my colleagues for coming out tonight, certainly the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

I want to just for a moment talk about some of the misconceptions that we have seen and heard here as Members of this great body. First of all, as Members of the Congress, our constituents have vested a unique trust in us to represent their interests to the fullest degree and to make decisions that have a tremendous impact on their daily lives.

□ 2145

Every day we are required to consider legislative proposals, policy solutions, and programmatic activities that shape the future of our Nation. In order to carry out our task for this greatest benefit of the American people, it is absolutely essential that the most accurate and current information be at our disposal. Anything less would force us to abdicate our duties and perform an extreme disservice to the American people.

So, Madam Speaker, I am growing increasingly disturbed and angered by the Bush administration's penchant for being less than truthful with the people's representatives.

One striking example of this tendency towards strategically bending the truth is the rationale provided for the Iraq War. What disturbs me most about the faulty reasoning provided by our rush to war is the fact that not only was our Nation's credibility at stake, but most importantly human lives were at stake. Recent remarks by the Spanish Prime Minister in which he called the United States' occupation of Iraq a fiasco, and those are his words, make it increasingly evident that international goodwill is beginning to turn against the United States.

Madam Speaker, it is clear that one of the very first casualties of this war was international respect for the United States of America. Although terrorists may be jailed or killed on the battlefield, the war against terrorism will be fought and won in the hearts and minds.

By advancing unilateralist policies that isolate the rest of the world without concrete proof of imminent threat, we have endangered not only our national security, but also our national identity.

The Bible says, "Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops."

Several revelations have come to light as of late that seem to indicate that the administration's reasoning for war was flawed and the information provided to the public as justification for the war was misleading. First, we had Secretary Paul O'Neill, a former member of President Bush's Cabinet, saying that invading Iraq was a top priority of this administration only 10 days after the inauguration of this administration. That is, in January of 2001, long before September 11, the administration had already had its sights on Iraq.

Then to add insult to injury, former U.S. weapons inspector David Kay testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that "we were almost all wrong" as it relates to our prewar intelligence. And Richard Clarke, the President's former counterterrorism adviser, is asserting that even though all credible evidence pointed to al Qaeda as being responsible for September 11, the administration still insisted on finding a link to Iraq.

And now, Madam Speaker, we have this report entitled "Iraq on the Record: The Bush Administration's Public Statements on Iraq" issued by the special investigations division of the Committee on Government Reform approximately 2 weeks ago and which was referred to by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) just a moment ago. This startling report, which I submit for the RECORD, chronicles over 200 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq that were made by this administration.

This chart, which was included within the report, graphs the occurrence and timing of these misleading statements. Madam Speaker, the Members may notice this sharp spike between August, 2002, and October, 2002. I am sure the Members will recall that this happens to be around the same time Congress was considering the resolution authorizing the use of force in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I am sure that it is far more than a coincidence that just as Congress was debating whether or not force was necessary in Iraq, President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, the administration, made 64 misleading statements in 16 public appearances. Madam Speaker, that amounts to more than two misleading statements per day during the 30-day period between September 8, 2002, and October 8, 2002.

I am sure that some of my colleagues across the aisle will find objection with this information, but in advance let me assure my critics that this report only contains statements that were misleading at the time that they were made. I am not referencing statements that the administration thought to be true at the time, but were proven false in hindsight. I am talking about statements that were not accurate reflections of the views of intelligence officials at the time they were made.

Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I am outraged by this purposeful twisting of the truth, and every American who believes in truth and justice should be outraged also.

Madam Speaker, unfortunately, the argument made for war in Iraq was not the only case wherein the administration has knowingly misled the Congress and the American public. In December of 2003, the administration sent Congress its "National Healthcare Disparities Report." As I am sure the Members are aware, Madam Speaker, the law requires the Department of Health and Human Services to report to Congress on national healthcare quality and national healthcare disparities.

These reports enable us, as legislators, to assess the status of the health care crisis in our Nation and propose new solutions to eliminating those barriers to ensuring quality and affordable health care to every single American.

Madam Speaker, eliminating disparities in treatment and access to health

care is a major priority of the Congressional Black Caucus. Oftentimes people speak of health care disparities as an abstract issue that only exists in the realm of policy and political discussions.

Under the leadership of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, we have tried to make the issue of health disparities one that people understand and that we are working diligently to improve through our health care disparities legislation. Apparently, Madam Speaker, instead of joining the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and other concerned Members of Congress in our effort to eradicate health disparities, the Bush administration has chosen to delude Members of Congress as to the extent and nature of the problem.

The report that the Department of Health and Human Services provided Congress was absolutely shameful. The Special Investigations Unit of the Committee on Government Reform has found that the Department of Health and Human Services altered conclusions of its scientists on health care disparities in order to gloss over the appearance of a national problem which is literally costing human lives.

A congressional investigation released in January entitled "A Case Study in Politics and Science: Changes to the National Healthcare Disparities Report," which I will submit for the RECORD, made some startling findings which I want to share with the American people tonight, Madam Speaker.

The investigation revealed that the Department of Health and Human Services' scientists "found 'significant inequality' in health care in the United States, called health care disparities 'national problems,' emphasized that these disparities are pervasive in our health care system and found that the disparities carry a significant 'personal and societal price' in its initial report."

However, the final version of the disparities report, that is the version the administration submitted to Congress, contained none, none, of these conclusions and instead minimized the importance and scope of the disparities in health care.

Madam Speaker, not only did the administration mislead all 535 Members of Congress by rewriting a scientific report required by law, but the administration officials were dishonest with me personally when I asked about the changes made to the report.

Dr. Carolyn Clancy, director of the Department of Health and Human Services Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, wrote a letter to me that began: "I am writing in partial response to your letter to Secretary Thompson expressing your concern that these changes were made to scientific facts and findings in the National Healthcare Disparities Report." She goes on to say, as we will see on

this chart, the very next sentence of the letter read: "At the outset I want to make it clear that no data or statistics in the report were altered in any way whatsoever."

This is a letter that she sent to me. However, Madam Speaker, if one were to visit the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's Web site right now, they would find another letter from Dr. Clancy which reads: "Over the course of the summer and fall, changes, with which I concurred," meaning she concurred, "were made to the report by a broad array of staff including Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality."

The question becomes, Madam Speaker, which one is the truth? Is this the truth, or is this the truth? No matter what, there is an inconsistency that goes to the heart of a major issue on health care disparities.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I ask how is it that Dr. Clancy can in good conscience tell me that no changes were made to the disparities report but a month later, after public pressure, admit that changes were indeed made?

Madam Speaker, this is about more than my feeling personally insulted by Dr. Clancy. Madam Speaker, this is an insult to African American women who are more than twice as likely to die of cervical cancer than are white women and are more likely to die of breast cancer than women of any other racial or ethnic group. This is an insult to African Americans who are having more strokes at earlier ages, who are more likely to die from them, and who experience worse levels of recovery than other racial groups. This is about the prevalence of high blood pressure within the African American community that ranks among the highest in the world. This is about the administration knowing that all of these problems exist and choosing to do absolutely nothing about it and, furthermore, masking the truth about its existence.

So I could go on and on, but it is so interesting too that on Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday, President Bush visited an African American church and said, "Today would have been his 75th birthday," and this is President Bush speaking as I conclude. "It's important for our country to honor his life and what he stood for."

Later in the day, the President visited Dr. King's memorial in Atlanta, Georgia, and held a moment of silence at his tomb. All of this was very moving and touching. Yet, Madam Speaker, the very next day the President appointed Judge Charles Pickering over the objection of United States Senators, the Congressional Black Caucus, and all of these civil rights organizations.

I find it rather ironic that 1 day after the photo-op with Dr. King's widow, Coretta Scott King, and after saying that the Nation should honor what Dr. King stood for, that President Bush would have appointed a judicial nominee that was vigorously opposed by nearly every single civil rights group in the entire Nation.

So I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), I thank him for yielding to me. Again, we all have come out. We could be at home resting, but we cannot rest when we see the deceptions that are taking place for we know that those deceptions lead to erosions. It is just like a water leak in one's house, drip, drip, drip; and every single drip, it may take a long time, but eventually something wears away. And we are convinced that we have to stand up. We could not sleep unless we did stand.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). The Chair would remind all Members not to attribute intentional misrepresentations to the President or Vice President.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his statement. I know he is also the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. And, again, I think it is important, whether it is foreign policy or domestic policy, that we point out that we are not getting accurate information from the White House and it makes it very difficult for us to proceed in making policy decisions if we cannot rely on accurate information from the White House.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

□ 2200

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today with such a pride in joining true patriots who are coming to the floor tonight under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus (Mr. CUMMINGS), and my colleague the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has really been a conscience for all of us, that we have to ask the questions.

We stand here as people who love our country. We love our country so much that we fought to be here to represent over 600,000 people, to represent the views of ordinary Americans, and we are here tonight because we are concerned that our country is losing its credibility and its moral leadership around the world; and that our democracy is in jeopardy right now, because democracy depends on the truth.

It depends on the light of day. It depends on discussions being held out in the open, so that people can make up their own minds, so the facts, the real facts, get laid on the table. And to question, yes, even to question the President of the United States, Madam Speaker, about things that have been said, and the Vice President of the United States.

No one in this great democracy is beyond being questioned, and that is the duty of Americans, not just of Members of Congress, but of citizens of the United States, of the media, of the press, to find out the truth.

Madam Speaker, for over 6 months this administration has been fighting tooth and nail against all of the facts being laid out in public before this commission investigating 9/11 and what happened. It is not just the 3,000-plus people that died that day, and it is not just the 570, 580 or 590-plus people now that have died in Iraq and their families that are suffering, presumably because we were fighting terrorism, and some of us question the rationale for that war. But all Americans deserve to know the truth, and this administration over the last 6 months has battled against the commission over access to documents and witnesses.

The panel has issued two subpoenas to the Federal Government for aviation and military records, and twice had to threaten to do the same for access to presidential briefing materials. The panel fought the White House over an extension of its statutory deadline for issuing a report which was originally set for May 27 in order to really do its job. There has been pressure on this commission not to explore fully and readily exactly what happened on 9/11.

Now, fortunately, under tremendous pressure right now, we are going to hear more information, under oath, from the National Security Advisor, who has found it fit to speak on every single broadcast and radio station and television program about this. But now under oath she will appear. I think this is a wise decision, and I am glad that it is going to happen.

But I want to talk for a minute about one of the strategies that is used to silence people who would ask those kinds of questions, who would come up with information that the administration does not like, that runs counter to the administration's version of the truth.

I am not saying that the other versions are always true or more correct, but what I am saying is that anyone who dares to stand up and say something different is slimed by this administration. Let me give you some examples of the ways in which the integrity, the competence, the motives and even the patriotism of those who raise questions is attacked.

The Medicare actuary who came up with the numbers that said that this Medicare bill that passed in the middle of the night, after arm-twisting and holding the record open for 3-plus hours, the actuary who came up with dollar figures that said it really was going to cost about \$140 billion more than the administration said, was warned that he would be fired if he told key lawmakers about a series of Bush administration cost estimates that would have torpedoed, or could have, any Congressional passage of this White House-backed Medicare prescription drug plan.

Richard S. Foster, the Chief Actuary for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, told colleagues last June that he would be fired if he revealed the numbers relating to higher estimates to lawmakers. This is a per-

son who was supposed to give us the truth. That is his job. He is supposed to come up with the facts. For doing so, he was told he would be fired.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Paul O'Neill, 3 days after Paul O'Neill criticized the Bush administration's Iraq policy, the administration, quoting from an Associated Press story, "began an investigation into whether any laws or regulations had been violated by O'Neill." The probe came despite O'Neill having specifically "cleared all of the documents with the Treasury General Counsel's Office."

Of course, the problem ended by fully absolving O'Neill. But, right away, rather than answering the charges that were raised, the administration went after the man and tried to undercut his credibility.

White House Adviser Larry Lindsey was fired when he told a newspaper that an Iraq war could cost \$200 billion.

General Anthony Zinni, fired, a retired Marine general who was Bush's Middle East mediator. He had the audacity to anger the White House when he told a public policy forum in October that "Bush had far more pressing policies than Iraq and suggested there could be a prolonged, difficult aftermath to the war. He was not reappointed as Mideast envoy." The source, and that is a quote, was the Associated Press in July of 2003.

Even troops fighting in Iraq were threatened for telling the truth about combat in Iraq. After soldiers in Iraq raised questions about the Bush administration's deceptive WMD comments, General John Abizaid said no soldiers "are free to say anything disparaging about the Secretary of Defense, or the President of the United States. Whatever action may be taken, whether it is a verbal reprimand or something more stringent, is up to the commanders on the scene." The source, ABC News.

No, we are not even going to let those who are putting their lives on the line publicly raise questions.

The CIA was blamed for telling the truth about bogus Iraq nuclear claims. Despite the CIA having made advance objections to the White House about false Iraq nuclear claims, "President Bush and his National Security Advisor yesterday placed full responsibility on the Central Intelligence Agency for the inclusion in this year's State of the Union Address of questionable allegations that Iraq's Saddam Hussein was trying to buy nuclear weapons."

So much for taking personal responsibility for words that come out of one's own mouth. Let us blame someone else.

And then, of course, there is Richard Clarke.

But even before I get to him, the Secretary of Commerce the other day, in talking about people who are concerned about losing their jobs, because jobs are being exported overseas, said that basically this kind of outsourcing is really a good thing for the economy.

"People who are out of work because of outsourcing, who said, no, they think maybe we ought to try and keep jobs at home, he called them economic isolationists, and he said economic isolationists wave the flag of surrender, rather than the American flag." That is a quote.

So, in other words, people who are out of work because their jobs have gone overseas and have the audacity to complain about our policies that do that are said to wave the flag of surrender and not the American flag.

What does that mean? They are not patriots? These people, whose children every day go to school and say the pledge to the flag while dad or mom is looking for a job?

THE CHALLENGING QUESTION OF JOBS LEAVING AMERICA

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House.

It is appropriate, I suppose, that we continue with the discussion we are having about jobs. It is an interesting one, it is a challenging one. It is certainly an issue that will be with us for quite some time, certainly during the next several months as we approach the election.

We know that there is a great deal of anxiety in the Nation, there is a great deal of concern about the degree to which the exportation of jobs from the United States, the outsourcing, as it is referred to, has affected our economy, has affected the unemployment statistics and affected Americans in ways that are quite alarming sometimes.

We wonder about exactly how it is that we can treat this issue. Number one, is it for real? The outsourcing of jobs has sometimes been described as a good thing from an economic standpoint. I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about that and suggest that someone was being disingenuous in that description.

Well, Madam Speaker, I do not know whether or not the outsourcing of jobs from the United States does in fact cause a net loss in jobs. I have a sneaky feeling it may. I am concerned about the possibility that it does.

We recognize that there is a phenomena, a world economy that challenges us as never before in terms of trying to figure out how exactly to address the issue of jobs, how to protect them.

In the past, and for the last actually 150 or so years, a lot of people have been wedded to the concept of free trade as described by various economists, from Ricardo and Adam Smith, and we adhere, most of us, to the concept that free trade is good in the long run and produces in fact a more viable

economy. That has been the mantra many people have chanted.

I do not hear, even from the other side, however, a resolution to this. I do not hear anybody saying, well, we should not have free trade, that we should establish some sort of economic barrier to free trade, we should establish tariffs.

They can and do rail about the fact that we are maybe losing jobs in this new economy, in this new-world economy, and that it is, of course, therefore the President's fault. No one has in fact, that I know of, come up with a plan that would suggest a protectionist policy be implemented, that in fact we should begin to look at things like tariffs to protect American jobs. That is a hard case to make, and it is one alternative, of course, to the present course of free trade.

We can begin to restrict America's trade policies. We can begin to erect barriers. We can begin to say to other countries that if they do not react in what we would call a fair way to our trade policies that we will in fact impose some sort of penalty, we will raise a tariff barrier.

We can in fact even adopt policies, tax law, that would be designed to prevent companies from or punish companies for offshoring jobs, for moving jobs from the United States to other countries.

□ 2215

Those are policy options. Now, would they stop the offshoring of jobs? Would people then say, okay, because I have to pay an extra tax for doing that, I will not adopt this particular procedure? Well, I do not know. In some cases, it may work; in other cases, it may not.

Because, in reality, the competitive world in which we live is one that does not care whether or not jobs are lost in any particular country. It does not matter. The economy does not have a conscience. The world economy does not look at a net loss of jobs in country A and a net increase in jobs in country B and say, there is something immoral about that. It just says, that is the way it has to work.

This is difficult for any Member of Congress, for any Member, any elected person in the United States to have to deal with, because our natural tendency is to say, here is what we will do to solve that problem. We will stop this. We will not allow jobs to be exported from the United States. We will do things that absolutely ensure that we will always have a very high standard of living and that our jobs will be protected. That is what we would like to do. But, of course, the problem is how to do that.

I assure my colleagues, nothing we heard tonight from the other side is a solution. Nothing. It is simply a series of complaints; and it is demagoguery to stand up on this floor or anywhere else and simply rail against the "loss of jobs" unless one is willing to come

forward and say, here is what we will do to stop that. We will begin to impose protectionist measures. We will say to other countries that we will not allow your goods into our country because you are subsidizing them in your country, and it is unfair. We will punish corporations for sending jobs offshore.

Now, we can do that, we can say that, and we can even actually pass laws to accomplish those goals. But will they stop this phenomenon? Can we do anything to reverse what appears to be an inevitable change in the economic status of America and of America's workers?

I do not come to this floor to tell my colleagues that I have an economic model we can impose that I know will achieve the goal of keeping jobs in America and keeping our standard of living high. But I do have a suggestion that I believe we can look to and that all of us should be able to say, this may work. It is both logical and it is, in fact, the responsible thing to do.

But we will never hear, Madam Speaker, we will never hear our opponents, ever, suggest what I am going to suggest as a way of protecting American jobs, because their purpose is not to protect American jobs. Their purpose is to make political points. Their purpose is to make Americans, who are fearful of their own jobs and those who have lost jobs, vote for them, as opposed to the President or Republicans, just out of the fear. But there is never a solution that they propose, and certainly not the one that I am going to suggest tonight.

Madam Speaker, in this country today there are between 13 million and 15 million people who are here illegally. That is to say, they have come across the border of the United States without our permission. For the most part, they have come for the purpose of taking jobs. We hear this all the time, even from people on our side of the aisle, that the people who are coming here illegally are coming here simply to take the jobs that no one else will take.

Well, I do not know how it is in the districts of my colleagues or anywhere else in the country, but I will tell my colleagues that in my district there are many people who are out of work and who are looking for any job. They will take a job in the high-tech sector from which they were fired because someone came in to work for less money, or their job was outsourced, or they will take a job, many people, who do not have the kinds of skills that would allow them to even think about a job in the high-tech industry, they will take a job as roofers or as drywall hangers or as bricklayers or as, yes, even, believe it or not, people who would clean our houses or cut our lawns. They are people who are in desperate need of a job.

But we are importing millions of people to take those jobs. Why? Because they will take them for less money

than the previous person was willing to take. It is a constant series of someone undercutting the person who was there for their job.

Now, this importation of cheap labor has an effect on our economy. And, yes, it is true that some commodities are less expensive and that we can probably get our lawns cut, our laundry done, our houses cleaned, and any one of a variety of other things for less money because there are so many people here who are willing to work for very little, and they have displaced the person who was doing that job for a little more. So to that extent it benefits a certain segment of our society. In the long run, however, I think it is a detriment to all of us.

So if we really wanted to address the issue of jobs, why would we not say that one way to do it is to, in fact, limit the number of people who are coming into this country illegally, why would we not say that we are going to defend our borders, stop the importation of cheap labor illegally into this country and even reverse the flow by levying fines against people, which is the law, of course. The law today allows us to levy fines against people who have hired people who are here illegally. And if we do that, we will, in fact, be able to reverse this flow.

People who are here illegally, if they are not able to obtain jobs and the social service benefits that we so liberally provide, they will return to their country of origin. We do not have to "round them up in cattle cars" and send them out or anything of that nature. These are the pictures that our opponents try to portray all the time of this horrendous experience. But, in fact, we could simply enforce the law and secure the border and achieve the goal of reducing the number of people who are here illegally.

But those people who do not go home under those conditions should, in fact, be deported, because that is the law. We may not like the law. There are a number of people on the other side who, of course, despise the law, but it is the law, and it is something that we must deal with. We can try to ignore it. We can try to pretend these laws do not exist. We can try to pretend the laws about immigration are nothing more than the selections on a Chinese restaurant menu: We will take one order of this, two orders of that, no rice, and be particular about which laws we will, in fact, enforce and which laws we will not. But that is not the way our society is built.

Madam Speaker, we are supposed to be a nation based on the rule of law and the respect for the law; and the law says if you are here illegally, you should be deported. The law says that if you hire someone who is here illegally, you should be fined; and if you continue to do it, you could actually go to jail. That is the law. In this body where we make law, this is supposed to be the place where we have the ultimate respect for the law.

Yet the members of the other side and even members of our own party would rather ignore the law, would rather suggest it does not exist and that we will look the other way. Because, on the one side, they are concerned about the votes that they would be losing if we stopped the flow of immigration, both legal and illegal, or reduced it; and on our side, oftentimes because we are fearful that we will stop the flow of cheap labor. In any case, the borders remain porous, and the numbers begin to overwhelm us.

Let me point out something that I find absolutely incredible. First of all, let me say, Madam Speaker, that when I go down and visit the border and talk to our Border Patrol people, which I do often on both the southern and northern borders, one of the things I hear most often is an admonition from them, and it goes something like this: Congressman, when you go back up there, please, please tell your colleagues, do not talk about, do not ever mention the word "amnesty" for the people who are here illegally. Because they say every time that happens up there, meaning here, the flood we are trying to stop on the border becomes a tidal wave, naturally, of people who are coming to obtain this "amnesty." If they can sneak in under the radar screen, if they can sneak in in time, they will get an amnesty. That is what they think. So the numbers become overwhelming.

Let me tell my colleagues what has happened in one sector, one portion of our border, the Tucson sector, which, of course, as my colleagues know, is just one spot along a 5,000-mile border, north and south. Since October 1 of last year, which is the beginning of our fiscal year, to date, about 6 months, the number of people interdicted, the number of people stopped at the Tucson sector in the last 6 months has reached 211,450. That was as of a few days ago. They are stopping about 3,000 or 4,000 a night. Almost a quarter of a million people by now in 6 months have been stopped at the Tucson sector, on the Tucson sector of the border.

Madam Speaker, for every single person that comes into this country, I mean every single person that we stop at the border, 2 or 3, 5 or 10, we do not know for sure how many, but certainly a minimum of let us say 2, for every one we get, 2 get by us, minimum. It is probably far more than that, but a minimum of 2. That means that in the last 6 months, a half a million people have entered this country illegally just in the Tucson sector, and successfully entered the country. Madam Speaker, a half a million people in 6 months in one sector. This is, by the way, a 46 percent increase from this time last year.

In the month of March, apprehensions, with at this point 3 days still remaining, are 62,946, the month of March. That is up 34,100 from last year, an increase of 85 percent. Madam Speaker, 3,067 when this report was done, which was 3 days ago, 3,067 were

caught yesterday, according to the Border Patrol. By the way, April and May are typically the peak months ahead of a hot summer. Madam Speaker, a half a million people came into this country illegally in 6 months in one sector.

Where do they go? Now if, in fact, they are just coming for the jobs Americans will not take, which is what we hear all the time, right? What are the 500,000 jobs those people are going to take when they get here that are just waiting out there? Right? Because, of course, that is what we are told is the case, that there are millions and millions of jobs going begging. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues, in my colleagues' districts, are there thousands and thousands of jobs we cannot fill? I tell my colleagues it is not the case in my district.

□ 2230

I do not know of a district where want ads are going without response. Nobody wants the job. Thousands and thousands. 500,000 in the last 6 months. Where are they going? Where are they working? Are they, in fact, just taking jobs Americans do not want? Or are they, in fact, displacing American and/or immigrant labor who came here before them and doing so because they will work for less?

The President said in his speech that he wants to match every willing worker with every willing employer. But I ask the President to please think about that statement. I ask him to determine whether or not he really means that, matching every willing worker with every willing employer.

Well, I would suggest that there are billions of willing workers all over the world looking for the opportunity to come here and, in fact, undercut someone, underbid someone who is presently here for their job. Do we really believe that? If so, why do we even have immigration policy? If, in fact, our purpose is to simply let markets determine the flow of goods, services, and labor, why do we have immigration policies? Why do we say here is how many people can come into this country legally? Why do we not just say the border is meaningless, but if you get here, however you get here, you are here. You are a resident. You can apply for any job, you can obtain any benefit, you can even vote.

What is the purpose of a border if we are really and truly going to say whatever person is willing to work should be matched with any person willing to employ them? At that point in time it truly is a world economy, is it not? What sense does a border make under those conditions?

Why should we impose any restrictions? Why should we hand out visas? Because it does not matter, you see. If people are coming here to work and there are employers willing to hire them and they are willing to work for even less than that employer is paying at the present time, why should we

interfere? It is just markets. It is just the way of the market and the world economy.

Well, Madam Speaker, I do not know whether we can begin to control the flow of jobs offshore, being exported offshore. I do not know because technology today, of course, makes it incredibly difficult to control the flow of work to worker. And you can push, you can move work to worker anywhere in the world because of technology. It is true.

I do not know whether there is any law we can pass, which is one reason our friends on the other side do not suggest them, because they do not know either; and they are petrified to say something like we will actually impose a tariff. They will not say it because they are afraid of the ramifications of it also. So they simply scream about jobs.

Well, whining and screaming and complaining will not change a thing. It may get more of them elected, it may get more people to vote against the President and against Republicans, that is their purpose, that is all they care about. But it will not change the job situation in this country. But I suggest that everyone in this body, and the President could do something tomorrow to improve the jobs situation in our country without imposing a tariff, without taking one protectionist step, but they could begin to enforce the law, the law that is presently on the books that says you cannot hire people who are here illegally, the law that says you cannot come into the country illegally. That is all we need to do to improve the job situation in America dramatically.

Because, Madam Speaker, it is not just, by the way, people coming here to do menial jobs who are sneaking into the country. There are people paying thousands and thousands of dollars to be snuck into the country. They are not coming in, by the way, to work in the local 7-Eleven or in somebody's vineyard. They are coming in for other purposes. Some of them very nefarious purposes, some of them paying thousands of dollars to be here.

In fact, Madam Speaker, some Middle Eastern clients will pay \$50,000 to be smuggled into the United States. As I say, they are not coming here to take a menial job. They are coming here for something else entirely. And I am fearful to think about what it is and how many are here and how many are coming here illegally, across those porous borders, alongside and in between and hidden among thousands of people who are coming just to take the jobs no American will take.

I dare us, I dare the President of the United States, I dare the Congress of the United States to test that theory. Just test it and see whether or not there really are all these jobs Americans will not take. Just test it. Let us see. And you know what? If we reduce the supply of cheap labor, yes, it is possible we will have to pay a little more for certain goods and services.

But, Madam Speaker, I am willing to take that chance. And I am willing to pay that price. Because porous borders are dangerous. They are dangerous to this country, they are dangerous to our economy, certainly, and they are dangerous, they are a danger for our survival. We must, in fact, do something to achieve some degree of security and control over our borders. It is imperative. It is the thing that distinguishes a country to be able to determine who comes and who goes and for what purpose and for how long.

And there is nothing racial about it; there is no ethnic issues, all the stuff that our opponents want to throw on this heap. You know all the epithets that they want to throw out. All the names that they want to call people who simply ask for secure borders will not stop certainly me, and I hope others, from raising the concern, from suggesting that it is imperative that our country secure its borders and uphold its laws.

If, in fact, we do not believe that there is a purpose; if, in fact, there is something wrong with our immigration policy; if we do not think there is a reason for us to actually have borders, have INS agents, have Border Patrol, then let us repeal them, repeal those laws. There is no purpose, is there, for them if we intend to ignore them?

There is a fascinating thing, Madam Speaker, there is a law on the books, we passed it in 1994 or 1996, I am not sure which, but it was a law that said this: That if any state or locality passes laws to restrict the ability of the State from obtaining—from the INS obtaining information, if you restrict the flow of information to or bar the flow of information from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, it is against the law. It says that is a violation of Federal law. Now, that is what we said. That is the law we passed. Unfortunately, we put absolutely no sort of penalty behind it.

And so, of course, States and cities routinely violate this law, passing what we call sanctuary city laws, telling their police departments, for instance, that they should not report when they actually arrest someone who is here illegally. They should not report that to the Federal Government.

Time and time again, by the way, we have situations where folks who are here illegally, commit a crime, they are caught, there is an adjudication, they sometimes are sentenced; but no one ever tells the INS, so, of course, the INS does not come and deport them, which is what they are supposed to do because they do not know they are there. And this person walks out on the street and commits another heinous crime. Time and time again this has happened.

There are literally thousands of cases where people who are here illegally and who should have been deported because they have committed a crime, but they were not deported because that crime was never, ever reported to the INS.

And we have said that that is against the Federal law.

I tried to add a penalty to that in the last session of Congress and I was unsuccessful. I tried to say that no one could apply, no State or city, could apply for funds under the Homeland Security Act or when we were also passing the Justice appropriation, nobody could get funds, nobody could get grants if they had passed these sanctuary laws. I think we got about 120 votes.

Now, that is incredible to me. Here is a body that passed a law and said it was illegal to do something, but when we tried to apply a penalty to it, we could not get a majority of the members to agree to it. This is a travesty, Madam Speaker. This is a travesty. And it truly is something that we as a Nation have to think about in terms of calling ourselves, if we want to go around the world and talk about the fact that we are a Nation that reveres the rule of law. And, yet, we refuse to actually enforce our own.

And so I say to my colleagues, I have told the President that if he does not believe in borders and if he does not believe in immigration law, then let us repeal them. It would be better to do so than to pretend as though we have them but only be selective in the way we enforce them.

Now, I am a "no" vote, by the way. I believe that immigration laws are important, I believe borders are important, but if I am in the minority in that, so be it. That is the way our government is supposed to work. But I want a full-fledged debate, and I want our colleagues to have to stand up on the floor and take a vote.

And I want the President of the United States to take a position on whether or not borders matter. Because if they do, then there are decisions that you have to make. If borders matter, then you have to defend them. You have to secure them. If they are of no consequence, then simply take down the barriers, take down the ports of entry, abolish the Border Patrol, abolish the INS, because there is no purpose for them. They are a very expensive sort of luxury to have to pretend that we have an immigration policy which we do not have the slightest intention of actually enforcing.

There are enormous implications to porous borders. There are political implications, there are cultural, there are economic, there are social, and there are national security implications. Besides that, there is another aspect to this: massive immigration into this country, into any country, actually, when that immigration meshes with, combines with a sort of, what I call a radical multi-culturalism, a philosophy that permeates the society, a philosophy that tells our children and immigrants that there is nothing of value in our country, nothing to hold on to, no heritage worth someone's allegiance, when we tell our own children in schools that there is no reason for

them to have any attachment to Western Civilization or to the American experience; and we tell immigrants the same thing that they should keep their language, that we will actually teach them in the language that they have when they come here, teach their children in that language other than English, when we encourage them to stay separate, when we encourage them to actually keep their political allegiances to the country of origin. This becomes extremely problematic, and it goes even beyond the other issues of economy, of jobs, health care issues, social issues.

□ 2245

This goes to really the core of our society and whether we are going to be able to remain a Nation at all.

And this is happening, this cult of multiculturalism, it certainly does permeate our society. We see signs of it all over the place. As an example: at Los Angeles Roosevelt High School, an 11th grade teacher told a nationally syndicated radio program that she dislikes the textbooks she has been told to use and the State's mandated dated history curriculum because they ignore students of Mexican ancestry. She says because the students do not see themselves in the curriculum, she has chosen to "modify that curriculum by replacing it with activities like mural walks." Mural walks. These are intended to open the eyes of the students to their indigenous culture.

When on one of these walks they were confronted by one of the individuals who had made one of these painted murals, they became the teacher and went on to tell the children that their education is one big lie after another and that they essentially have no reason to be connected to the American experience and they should, in fact, hate it.

Now, this is one tiny example that is magnified 100,000 times around the Nation in a million ways.

In a textbook called "Across the Century," which is used for 7th grade history, the book defines the word jihad as "to do one's best to resist temptation and overcome evil."

In 2002, the "New Guidelines For Teaching History" in the New Jersey public schools failed to mention America's Founding Fathers, the Pilgrims, or the Mayflower.

In a Prentice Hall textbook used by students in West Palm Beach, titled "A World in Conflict," the first five pages of the World War II chapter cover such topics as women in the Armed Forces, racial segregation and the war, Black Americans and the home front, Japanese Americans being interned, and women and the war effort. Now, Madam Speaker, some 292,000 Americans died in that war, almost all of them white; but in the school text white male soldiers are represented far less in photos and words than all others.

A Washington State teacher substituted the word Christmas with the

word winter in a carol to be sung in a school program so as not to appear to be favoring one faith over another.

In a school district in New Mexico, the introduction to a textbook called "500 Years of Chicano History in Pictures" states this book was written in response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776 American Revolution. Not a bad idea. This is an interesting thing. But it was written "in response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776 American Revolution and its lies." That is what the book was written for. Its stated purpose is to celebrate "our resistance to being colonized and absorbed by racist empire builders." The book describes defenders of the Alamo as slave owners, land speculators, and Indian killers. Davey Crockett is described as a cannibal. The 1847 war on Mexico is described as an unprovoked U.S. invasion. The chapter headings include, Death to the Invader, U.S. Conquest and Betrayal, We Are Now a U.S. Colony, In Occupied America, and They Stole the Land. This is a textbook used in New Mexico.

There are literally hundreds of examples that I could give of this cult of multiculturalism, this attempt to make children sensitive to other cultures by degrading our own. This is the concept that we live in this world where I am okay, you are okay cultures and civilizations; that everyone is the same as everyone else and that all things are relative. We cannot condemn or look down upon or criticize any other nation, culture, or civilization.

Well, this has seeped into the fabric of our society to the point where about a month ago I went to a high school in my district. It was recently built and in one of the wealthiest counties in America. It was a beautiful school, with all the finest trappings, and bright-eyed bushy-tailed kids who certainly were competent in skills in a variety of areas. They came in to talk to me. We had about 200 of them. And at the end of the conversation, they sent up several questions. One of them was, What do you think is the most serious problem we face as a Nation?

I said, Well, before I answer that question, I am going to ask you a question. Remember, 200 high school students. I said, How many of you believe that you live in the greatest country on Earth? Take a guess, Madam Speaker, as to how many raised their hand. Out of 200 students, and the question was, Do you believe you live in the greatest country on Earth, about two dozen said yes. About two dozen actually raised their hands.

Now, I found this incredible. And what I said was, I can answer your question now about what I think is the greatest problem. And this is it, the fact that 175 of you or so could not answer this question in the affirmative.

And many of them, Madam Speaker, I do not think for a moment were saying I hate America. Most of them simply could not feel comfortable about

raising their hand because they may have been asked to actually defend the proposition, and that is what made them uncomfortable. I taught for many years, and I could see that look in their eyes: if I raise my hand, you might call on me, and I do not know if I can actually defend that proposition, that America is the greatest. What if you ask me to prove it? What if you ask me why I believe that it is? So it is best I just do not even raise my hand.

And it is because, Madam Speaker, that they have been taught that they should not dare suggest that this is something good, individually significant, and in fact the best. What would people think if you said you lived in the best country in the world? How would they react? How would I defend it? This is the product of this multiculturalist phenomenon.

And when you combine it with massive immigration into the country, of people who are not coming here necessarily to become American but simply to get the job no one else would get, and you tell them this same stuff, that there is nothing unique, nothing good, nothing of value, then we are creating a Balkanized society that will not know the answer to the question of who are we.

Who are we, is a great question. What is our purpose? What is the thing that we should all be gathering around? Are there any ideas or ideals that all of us, regardless of whether we are from Azerbaijan or Zimbabwe, whoever we are, when we come here to the United States, is there nothing at all that we should establish as being the primary thing people should adhere to; some ideas that are of value and that separate us from all the rest of the world; things like the concept of the rule of law; all of those things that are identified in the Bill of Rights, especially in the first amendment?

Those are uniquely Western ideas. This Nation, as opposed to all other nations, was founded on ideas. No other nation has that claim. In that respect, we are unique and wonderful. But we are also vulnerable. I mean, it is in fact ideas that we need to hold us together. It is not ethnicity. We do not all look the same and have the same background. We did not come here speaking the same languages or even worshipping the same God. So what other nations have to hold them together, the culture that they share in common, we do not have.

All we have, Madam Speaker, is ideas that made this country, and they are articulated in the Constitution and especially in the Bill of Rights. And it is imperative we tell our children in high school about them and that we transmit those values and ideas and ideals to them. It is imperative that we ask, in fact demand from people who are coming in to this country, that they also adhere to them.

That is not too much to ask. We are not asking people to change their religion. We are not asking them to

change their cultural identity. We are asking them to rally around a set of ideas. We should be asking, and we used to ask that. We asked it of my grandparents. But we do not ask it any more. In fact, we attempt to stop it. There is this hatred. It is almost a death wish for the country, in a way, that continues to push us in this direction, this radical multiculturalist path.

There are certain ideas that supercede others, and I suggest that diversity is not one of them. I mean, the one thing that we supposedly all have in common should not be our love of diversity. There are other things that are more important. There are ideas that are more important, and we should teach our children about them, and we should teach immigrants to respect and adhere to them. We do not do this, I think, to our peril.

So when I talk about the issue of immigration and immigration reform, it is not simply because I am concerned about jobs, which of course I am, and I believe it is a significant factor and something we should talk about when we talk about jobs. It is not just because I am concerned about the impact on our economy in terms of the health care costs and social service benefits that massive immigration imposes on us, although I am concerned about that. And it is certainly a concern about the costs we have to incarcerate. Twenty-five percent of the population of our Federal prisons, 25 percent, are people who are noncitizens of the United States. These are huge costs we incur.

Cheap labor is not cheap. Or I should say it is only cheap to the employer. It is not cheap to the rest of us. It costs a fortune. And those things we should talk about. But those things are not even the most dangerous aspects of massive immigration, both legal and illegal, until it combines with this cult of multiculturalism. That is the dangerous thing.

And this is a tough subject. It is very difficult sometimes, I know, to make this case because it requires us to really think about this in depth. You can make bumper stickers out of a chunk of this discussion, but you really have a hard time conveying this in a 30-second commercial. It is so much easier to use slogans and demagoguery, as our opponents are so able to do and so wont to do.

I do hope that we will think about this. I introduced a resolution a couple of weeks ago; and it simply states that all people, all children graduating from our schools, it is a sense of the Congress, should be able to articulate an appreciation for Western Civilization. What is so tough about that? And yet I do not know whether we are even going to get it on the floor of this House for fear someone will be offended by the discussion of whether or not our children should be able to articulate an appreciation of Western Civilization.

Now, you may say, well, who could be against that? How could anybody be

against it? Why should we not be able to do that? Well, because, of course, we may be offending someone else.

□ 2300

We are not saying that anybody should condemn any other civilization, should criticize any other civilization. We are just saying they should be able to articulate an appreciation of western civilization, which is what started this. I do not care again if you are here from Azerbaijan or Zimbabwe. Anybody coming here should eventually be able to articulate that appreciation. It is important because it does in fact establish a canon, a set of ideas, around which we should all gather.

I have introduced that resolution. I have also asked other State legislators all over the country to do the same thing. I think to date we have 15 or 20 State legislators who have agreed to do so in their individual States. I have several hundred people who have gone to our Web site, www.house.gov/tancredo, and gone to Our Heritage Our Hope page and there they can sign up, they can take a resolution, I have got a model resolution that they can take to their school board and have them pass it saying that their children will be able to articulate this.

I hope people will do that. I hope people will actually go to our Web site, take that resolution, go to their school board and ask them to adopt it. If nothing else but to hear the debate that will ensue. If nothing else but to hear somebody say, oh, no, we could not, absolutely could not ask a student or demand that of our students, that they be able to articulate an appreciation for western civilization. Would that not be an interesting debate? I hope they will do it.

Once again, it is www.house.gov/tancredo, go to Our Heritage Our Hope.

I hope they do it, Madam Speaker; and I hope all over this country we will begin this debate as to whether or not this is an important requirement and whether it is meaningful and whether our children and the people who come into this country should be able to rally around a set of ideas that separate us from all other places.

Because, Madam Speaker, I have absolutely no doubt about it, this is the greatest nation on the face of the earth. There is plenty of empirical evidence to prove it. Because when the gates are opened all over the world, which way and where do people go? You just do not see that many fleeing from the West to say, Pakistan or Zimbabwe or anywhere else, but you see millions flowing here.

People do speak and vote with their feet; and to the extent that they can get here, they will come, or to western Europe, because it offers something that they do not have. It offers hope. I do not blame them for trying to come. It is the hope and desire I think of most people to certainly improve the quality of their life economically.

But all I am saying is that, when you get here, there is more to being an

American than just getting a job. At least there should be. It should mean more than that. Or else we are just a place of residence, that is all, not citizens. We are just a place of residence, people who reside here, not people who have an affinity for the ideas and ideals that made America what it is. This is my fear. It is one that is sometimes difficult to encapsulate, even in an hour-long speech, although I appreciate the ability that the House provides for us to come here on the floor and opine like this.

It is I think a very serious issue, and I hope and I pray that we will as a Nation begin to grapple with it and that even in this House we will begin to debate what it means to be an American and what we have to do in terms of our own domestic policy and our immigration policy to enhance that concept. It will determine not just what kind of a nation we are in the future that is balkanized, united or divided, it will determine whether we are a nation at all, and that is why we absolutely must enter into this debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7350. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Farm Loan Programs Account Servicing Policies—Elimination of 30-Day Past-Due Period (RIN: 0560-AG50) received March 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Evaluation of the TRICARE Program FY 2004 Report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7352. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposal to transfer the historic harbor tug ex-HOGA (YTM 146) to the Arkansas Inland Maritime Museum, North Little Rock, Arkansas, a non-profit organization, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7306; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7353. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Prohibiting Against Circumventing Treatment as a Nationwide Consumer Reporting Agency (RIN: 3084-AA94) received March 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Additional Form

8-K Disclosure Requirements and Acceleration of Filing Date [Release Nos. 33-8400; 34-49424; File No. S7-22-02] (RIN: 3235-A147) received March 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7355. A letter from the Director, OSHA Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Diving Operations [Docket No. S-550] (RIN: 1218-AB97) received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7356. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Sta., FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Skin Protectant Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use, Astringent Drug Products; Final Monograph, Direct Final Rule; and Confirmation of Effective Date; Corrections [Docket No. 78N-021A] (RIN: 0910-AA01) received March 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7357. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Sta., FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prior Notice of Imported Food Under the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002; Correction [Docket No. 2002N-0278] received March 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7358. A letter from the Counsel for Rule-making and Regulations, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Handling Critical Infrastructure Information; Interim Rule (RIN: 1601-AA14) received February 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7359. A letter from the Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7360. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the 2002 annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7361. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the FY 2003 Annual Program Performance Report, required by the Government Performance and Results Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7362. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Filing Claims Under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees Claims Act — received March 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7363. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Fulton, MO. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17149; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-15] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7364. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and A300 B4 Series Airplanes; A300 B4-600,

B4-600R, C4-605R Variant F, and F4-600R (Collectively Called A300-600); and A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-04-AD; Amendment 39-13491; AD 2004-04-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7365. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC 155B Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-12-AD; Amendment 39-13524; AD 2004-05-29] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7366. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2004-NM-17-AD; Amendment 39-13505; AD 2004-05-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7367. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34-8E Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2004-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-13485; AD 2004-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7368. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, AS350BA, AS350B1, AS350B2, AS350B3, AS350C, AS350D, AS350D1, AS355E, AS355F, AS355F1, AS355F2, and AS355N Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-44-AD; Amendment 39-13518; AD 2004-05-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7369. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Corporation Beech Models 45 (YT-34), A45 (T-34A, B-45), and D45 (T-34B) Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-09-AD; Amendment 39-13496; AD 2001-13-18 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7370. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc. Model Otter DHC-3 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-73-AD; Amendment 39-13493; AD 2004-05-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7371. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2004-NM-03-AD; Amendment 39-13514; AD 2004-05-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7372. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 365 N3 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-11-AD; Amendment 39-13523; AD 2004-05-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7373. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Neodesha, KS [Docket No. FAA-2004-16988; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-6] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7374. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Clinton, MO [Docket No. FAA-2004-16984; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-2] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7375. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Parsons, KS [Docket No. FAA-2004-16986; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-4] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7376. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Larned, KS [Docket No. FAA-2004-16990; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-8] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7377. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D and E Airspace; Olive Branch, MS [Docket No. FAA-2003-16534; Airspace Docket No. 03-ASO-19] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7378. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes; Model A300 B4-600, A300 B4-600R, and A300 F4-600R Series Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600); Model A310 Series Airplanes; Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes; Model A330-301, -321, -322, -341, and -342 Airplanes; and Model A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-302-AD; Amendment 39-13477; AD 2004-03-33] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7379. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd. Models N22B, N22S, and N24A Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-37-AD; Amendment 39-13494; AD 2004-05-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7380. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Springfield, MO. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16763; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-100] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7381. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 500 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-56-AD; Amendment 39-13525; AD 2004-05-30] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7382. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-301-AD; Amendment 39-13498; AD 2004-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7383. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Cedar Rapids, IA [Docket No. FAA-2004-17144; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-10] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7384. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2-1C, B2-203, B2K-3C, B4-2C, B4-103, and B4-203 Series Airplanes; Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R (Collectively Called A300-600) Series Airplanes; and Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-13499; AD 2004-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7385. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Des Moines, IA. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17145; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-11] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7386. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87) and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-13503; AD 2004-05-09] (RIN:

2120-AA64) Received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7387. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Festus, MO. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17148; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-14] received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7388. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate ST00516AT [Docket No. 2002-NM-238-AD; Amendment 39-13522; AD 2004-05-27] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7389. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-14-AD; Amendment 39-13521; AD 2004-05-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7390. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-390-AD; Amendment 39-13510; AD 2004-05-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7391. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advanced Technology Program [Docket No. 040209047-4047-01] (RIN: 0693-ZA56) received March 23,

2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

7392. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Implementation of the National Construction Safety Team Act [Docket No. 030421094-3094-01] (RIN: 0693-AB53) received March 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

7393. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowships (SURF) Gathersburg and Boulder Programs; Availability of Funds [Docket No. 040108008-4008-01] (RIN: 0693-ZA53) received March 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

7394. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Amendment to Final Agreement for Withholding Foreign Partnerships and Withholding Foreign Trusts and Additional Guidance for Qualified Intermediaries under Rev. Proc. 2003-64 (Rev. Proc. 2004-21) received March 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7395. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates (AFR) for April 2004 (Rev. Rul. 2004-39) received March 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7396. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Loss Limitation Rules [TD 9118] (RIN: 1545-BC84) received March 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.