United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 2004 No. 72—Part II

# House of Representatives

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4359, CHILD CREDIT PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION ACT OF 2004—Continued

□ 1445

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, how many times have we heard tax breaks for the rich in this body? Maybe their liberal Democratic base can believe it, but the American people are not stupid.

They said the marriage penalty was a tax break for the rich. There should be a reward for people that get married, not a disincentive. Yet my colleagues said, oh, it's a tax break for the rich.

Tax breaks for the family and the children, that is for the rich. Most Americans have children in this community and those that do not, adopt, like myself; and it is not just a tax break for the rich. But any tax relief for a working family, to my liberal colleagues on the other side, is a tax break for the rich. The American people are not stupid, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I invite Members to look up www.dsausa.org. This is their Web page. It stands for Democrat Socialists of America, DSA. Look what their 12-point agenda is. They talk about how they work with and they laud the Progressive Caucus, 58 Members of the House in the Progressive Caucus along with the Democrat Socialists of America. Their own Web page lists 12 points.

They want government control of health care; they sure tried to do that. They want government control of education; they have sure tried to do that. They want unions over small business. That is where they get their campaign money. They have sure done that.

They want the highest taxes possible. That is why any tax relief is for the rich only, because they want the justification to raise yours and my taxes, any working family.

And they want to cut defense by 50 percent; they have sure tried that.

Mr. Speaker, a man once called Abraham Lincoln two-faced. He said, do you think if I had two faces I would use this one. My colleagues on the other side say it is only tax breaks for the rich, but they have never seen a tax increase that they do not like. Also, if you look at the 13 appropriations committees, and I serve on the Committee on Appropriations, there is not a single one except for Defense that they do not want to increase, and increase the debt.

We just had a budget that limits spending. Most of my colleagues on that side of the aisle voted against it because they want to increase spending. They want to increase the debt. Yet they say, oh, don't vote for a tax break for the rich because it gives money to working families for children.

Yes, Abraham Lincoln was right. There are two faces on some people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to respond to the gentleman from California, if I may. I very rarely agree with anything he says.

I do agree with one thing he said and that is, the American people are not stupid. I would just like to say to him that the American people can add and they can subtract. The unpaid-for tax cuts, many of them for the wealthiest people of this country, that his party has championed during this last month have added $1.2 trillion to the Federal debt that is already nearly $7.2 trillion. That is an addition of $4,000 to each American's share of the Federal debt. Each citizen's share of the debt would be now, with all these tax cuts that they have passed that are not paid for, $28,479.

Most of us on this side of the aisle have absolutely no problem with the marriage penalty tax relief provisions and most of the child tax credits that are being discussed here today. What we do have a problem with is passing the bill on to our kids and our grandkids. That is fiscally irresponsible.

They should listen to one of the great leaders of their own party, Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, who said that the Republican Party used to be the party of fiscal responsibility. It used to be the party that would want to pay as you go. That is no longer the case. This is the most fiscally irresponsible Congress in the history of our country.

And so to the gentleman who spoke earlier, I would say my problem is not so much that we should not provide tax relief to middle-income families; my problem is that you are not paying for it and you are passing the bill on to my kids and my grandkids, and that is not right.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The Chair would remind Members to avoid improper references to the other body.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and for the underlying bill, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act.

If we do not pass this bill, the child tax credit, which is currently $1,000, will go down to $700 next year and then fall to $500 in 2011. In other words, if we do not act on this bill, taxes will increase for 30 million taxpayers.

This bill makes the $1,000 tax credit permanent and raises the eligibility limits for those who can claim the credit to include more middle-income parents so that more people can keep more of their own money.



Printed on recycled paper.

Americans deserve to keep more of their hard-earned money. For many families, $1,000 goes a very long way. Parents could invest the money for their child's education.

This bill also helps more of our men and women in uniform become eligible to receive the child tax credit. It would allow nontaxable combat pay to be taken into account when calculating the refundable portion of the tax credit. Currently, combat pay is excluded from calculating eligibility for the credit. This bill would allow low-income families to receive more of the child tax credit and to keep more of their own money.

I wholeheartedly support tax credits; however, I think we all need to remember whose money it is in the first place. It is not the government giving back its money to the people. It is the American taxpayers' money and they should be able to keep more of it, whether it is in the form of a tax credit or lower taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen firsthand in the past few years how much tax cuts have stimulated the economy. The American economy grew at a strong annual pace of 4.2 percent during the first quarter of 2004, well above the historical average. In fact, economic growth over the last three quarters has grown the fastest in nearly 20 years. Tax relief has helped drive the economic recovery forward, putting more money in the pockets of America's families and creating more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as a former businesswoman and realtor before I came to Congress, I know firsthand the impact that tax cuts have on businesses. And as a mother, I know how far $1,000 can go towards a child's education or for immediate needs like food, diapers, clothing, et cetera.

I urge all of my colleagues to support America's families and vote ''yes'' on the rule and on the underlying bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded, my colleague on the other side talked about middle income. I listened to the gentleman from Missouri that ran for President over and over and over again in the 1990s, 1991, 1992, 1993, talk about the middle class.

First of all, we should never use that term. There is no such thing as a middle class in this country. There are middle income, there is low income. But they play the race card, they play the social card every chance they get. Time after time they said, oh, we want tax relief for the middle income.

In 1993, when they had the White House, the House and the Senate, what did they do? They raised the highest tax on the middle income in the history of this country. They increased the tax on Social Security. They took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund. They cut the veterans' COLAs, the military COLAs. They gave us the highest gas tax possible. And they increased the tax on the middle income.

When we took the majority in 1994, we reversed those and they said, oh, look, the economy. After we reversed that tax, not a single Democrat economic structure or tax passed in this House or the other body and they said, ''Well, look. Look at the fine economy we had under President Clinton.''

Not one of President Clinton's measures ever passed in this House or was signed. So if that is the case, if we reversed that and none of their policies went forward since we have had the majority, then how can they be responsible for the good economy?

But, no, they will use every chance they can to say we want middle-class tax cuts, middle-class tax cuts. But when it comes time to do it, they will increase it every time because it increases their power to spend on big government.

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

I want to answer the gentleman's question. He asked, what did we give the American people when the Democrats had the White House and the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. We gave the American people one of the largest surpluses in the history of this country.

What have they given the American people now that they control the White House, House and the Senate? They have given the American people the largest deficit in the history of this country.

There is a clear difference.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, that is the whole idea. When the gentleman claims that they gave a surplus, we took away their Social Security tax increase. We restored veterans' pay. We restored military pay. We put their gas tax into a highway trust fund so we could build more. We took away the middle-class tax and we had our budgets to balance the budget. We had 9/11 and it has gone up, but their policies did not create that surplus. We did away with that tax and it was our policies that increased it, not decreased it.

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

I just would remind the gentleman again that yesterday he and a majority, almost every single member of the Republican Party, voted for a budget to increase the national debt to over $8 trillion. That is not something I think anyone can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I include for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post, entitled ''Leave No Rich Child Behind'' that refers to the bill we are talking about here today.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 2004]

LEAVE NO RICH CHILD BEHIND

The House Representatives plans to take up a bill this week that would provide new tax breaks to families earning as much as $309,000, while doing next to nothing for those at the low end of the income scale. The bill, which could come up as early as today, is the most egregious part of a House tax-cutting spree that altogether would add more than $500 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years, according to estimates by the Urban Institute-Brookings Institution Tax Policy Center.

The House would not only make permanent the $1,000-per-child tax credit enacted as part of the 2001 tax cut but would dramatically increase the income limits for eligibility. Currently, married families with incomes of up to $110,000 receive the full credit; the bill would more than double the income ceiling, to $250,000. Under existing law, families with two children and incomes up to $149,000 receive a partial tax credit; the bill would make that partial credit available to families with two children and income of between $250,000 and $289,000; families with three children would be entitled to the partial credit up to an income of $309,000.

This is unnecessary, misguided and irresponsible. Families at that income level have already enjoyed significant benefits from the recent tax cuts; they don't need an extra subsidy to help support their children. While tax cut proponents argue that lowering marginal tax rates or cutting dividend and capital gains taxes helps promote economic growth, there is no such claim to be made for the child tax credit. And the increase in the income ceiling would cost $69 billion through 2014, $87 billion if you count increased interest payments on the extra debt.

House Republicans have the gall to propose all this—and many House Democrats don't seem to have the spine to oppose it—while providing almost no extra help for the poorest families. Currently, low-income families who earn more than $10,750 are eligible for a small refundable tax credit. (These are families that pay payroll taxes but don't earn enough to be subject to paying income taxes, so they get a check back from the government.) For example, a married family with two children and an income of $12,000 gets $125 per child. The House bill would speed up by one year a planned increase in the size of this credit, giving low-income families a one-time average benefit of $150 per child. This remedies—belatedly—last year's mean-spirited omission of these families from the accelerated increase in the child tax credit enjoyed by higher-income taxpayers. The cost of this meager improvement: $1.8 billion.

For families earning less than $10,750, however, the House bill would do nothing. Thus, a family with a parent working full-time at the minimum wage ($10,300) would get no benefit from the bill. A better-off but still low-income family with two children would get a one-time $300 average tax break ($150 per child). By contrast, two-child families with earnings between $150,000 and $250,000 get $22,000 in extra tax breaks over the next 10 years ($1,000 per child per year). This is bad social policy, bad tax policy, and bad fiscal policy. You'd think they'd be embarrassed, but they're not.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying I hope that my colleagues will look seriously at the Rangel substitute. We provide a child tax credit, but we pay for it. I think that is the fiscally responsible thing to do.

We are now experiencing record deficits. We are going into debt. We are passing on to our kids an incredible bill. We need to be more responsible in this House. I would urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I vote ''yes'' today, I will be voting for America's hardworking families and their children. I will be voting to strengthen the economy and support American jobs, Mr. Speaker. I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting ''yes'' today on both the rule and the underlying bill. I cannot think of a better vote to take than a vote for America's children and families, the economy and American jobs. It is the right thing to do.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Pursuant to House Resolution 648 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4200.

□ 1458

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. UPTON (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 108–499, offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), had been postponed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to commend the leadership and hard work of Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member SKELTON in producing this Defense Authorization.

I'd also like to thank my distinguished colleague from Washington, Congressman BAIRD, for offering this amendment with me.

In March, we heard about a higher suicide rate for our troops in Iraq than elsewhere. We've heard about problems with morale.

We're all committed to maximizing our troops' effectiveness. To keep them in fighting shape, we've got to safeguard their psychological resiliency.

We know from past experience, articles in the press, and meeting personally with our returning troops the difficulties of readjusting to civilian life after duty in a combat area.

They're troubled by anxiety and sleeplessness bred by the hyper-vigilance required in combat. At its utmost worst, the ravages of war on a person's psyche may change them completely from those who knew them before, manifesting itself in depression, drug abuse, domestic violence, or suicide—we need to protect our troops from that.

The intensity and nature of ground combat and urban warfare our troops face may produce some of the most lingering scars of war, those that lie beneath the skin: The emotional and the psychological.

And the stress and emotional hardship our military families cope with may not necessarily end with the return of their loved ones.

Our Nation and our Department of Defense need to address these needs and with this amendment, we make sure that they will.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CUNNINGHAM for his leadership on this issue, and rise in strong support of the Cunningham-Harman amendment.

Let me tell you a story about four exceptional people who shared several things in common. What are the things that Jose Gutierrez, Jesus del Suarez, Francisco Martinez-Flores, and Jose Garibay had in common? They all loved this country, they all served in the U.S. Marine Corps, and they all died fighting for this country in Iraq. Something else they shared, Mr. Chairman—none of them were U.S. citizens.

The amendment we are now considering appropriately recognizes these four young men and the thousands of other noncitizens whose service and ultimate sacrifice often goes overlooked.

Based on legislation that Representative CUNNINGHAM and I introduced last fall, this amendment authorizes construction of a memorial at Arlington National Cemetery honoring the noncitizens killed in the line of duty while serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Many of our military heroes, past and present—from the American Revolution to Operation Iraqi Freedom and beyond—were, like Jose, Jesus, Francisco and Jose—born outside of the United States. In fact, an estimated 20 percent of Medal of Honor recipients—the Nation's highest military honor—are immigrants.

Among the hundreds of U.S. service men and women we have lost in Iraq, at least 24 are foreign-born.

A quote etched at Arlington's Memorial Amphitheater translates from Latin to read, ''It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country.'' Those words hold just as true for our foreign-born patriots who have served and made the ultimate sacrifice for their adopted country.

Our amendment honors the memory of these young men and all of our noncitizen heroes. It is the least we should do for them, their families and in acknowledgement of their sacrifice.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The amendment would honor noncitizens killed in the line of duty while serving in the U.S. Armed Forces with a memorial in Arlington National Cemetery.

Throughout American history, foreign-born men and women have served in our military, standing shoulder to shoulder with U.S. citizens in defense of our Nation. Today, there are over 36,000 noncitizens serving in our Armed Forces. Tragically, in the first year of the war in Iraq alone, 24 of these brave service members made the ultimate sacrifice, giving their lives for their adopted country.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that we can never fully express our gratitude for the service and sacrifice these heroes have made. However, establishing a memorial at Arlington National Cemetery in their honor is a fitting way to show the appreciation of a grateful Nation for the thousands of people who have come to this great country and given their lives for America.

I thank my colleague from California for offering this amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to give it their strong support.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, while I voted against the resolution authorizing the war with Iraq and whole-heartedly disagree with the way this administration has handled the conflict in Iraq, I strongly support our troops. Congress has been unwavering in its support for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, passing resolutions and giving speeches praising their sacrifice and courage. However, such words are hollow if Congress does not proceed with real action. For that reason, I have supported legislation in the past and will support the bill in front of us today because it provides our tireless troops with the benefits they so rightfully deserve.

This bill will make long-overdue changes to the current military pay and benefit rules for all members of the Armed Services. Among other things, this legislation will make permanent the increases in ''combat pay,'' the Family Separation Allowance and hardship duty pay that Congress passed on a temporary basis last year. More than any tax cut ever could, these increased benefits will provide substantive relief to the soldiers and their families in their time of need.

This bill also recognizes the vital contribution that reservists have made to our country's military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Indeed, our country has not depended on the members of the Reserve forces and National Guard as much as we do now since the Korean war. This bill appropriately ensures that, after uprooting these men and women from their lives and putting them in the line of fire, they do not return home without adequate benefits. This bill extends healthcare coverage to National Guard members and reservists and their families who lack health insurance. It also provides pay parity to reservists, ensuring that reservists are paid the same bonuses and special pay as active duty members are.

Not only does passing this bill keep our commitment to our troops, it also importantly keeps the promise we made to our country's veterans years ago. For years, the widows of veterans have unfairly seen their survivor benefit decrease after the age of 62, even though in many cases, retirees and survivors were never informed of the reduction when they signed up for the plan. This bill would rightly eliminate the reduction in the Survivor Benefit Plan annuities, thereby upholding our country's commitment and restoring the faith of our veterans who were unaware of the reduction.

While I do not believe this bill is perfect, I cannot in good faith turn my back on the courageous men and women who have so valiantly served to preserve the peace in Iraq and Afghanistan and protect our safety at home. Also, I am pleased to vote for a bill that delivers on a promise that we made to veterans and their families years ago—to provide surviving spouses the full benefits they deserve and the benefits that were promised to them.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this defense authorization bill. We are voting today on another bloated Pentagon budget full of wasteful and irresponsible spending. It seeks billions more for Iraq without mention of an exit strategy. It does not go far enough to help our troops who continue to fight in harms way.

This bill continues to waste billions on the development of ineffective or duplicative weapons systems that pad the pockets of big defense contractors. It authorizes $10.2 billion on pie in the sky missile defense, a $1 billion increase over last year. Yet, this unproven cold war concept does not address the very real security threat posed by weapons of significant magnitude that are readily delivered in a suitcase or cargo container.

This bill also throws money at building up nuclear weapon capabilities for use in conventional warfare. It authorizes $28 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator or ''nuclear bunker buster bomb'' and $9 million for research on so-called low-yield nuclear weapons to be deployed in combat. The bill also provides nearly $30 million to replace plutonium pits in existing nuclear warheads without evidence that such upgrades are necessary.

This rush to nuclear weapons development won't deter terrorists or rogue nations like North Korea. It challenges them to answer in kind, especially as the Bush administration pursues its belligerent policy of preemption. It also undermines cooperative efforts to stop the proliferation of destructive weapons that keep them out of the hands of those who would do us harm.

There is no question that this money is better spent securing uranium stockpiles, assisting cooperative threat reduction and advancing nonproliferation programs. But Republicans seem content to take that gamble with our national security and the cooperative security of the world.

This bill also authorizes the President's request for $25 billion for Iraq. Make no mistake, our troops in Iraq deserve all the support we can provide to keep them safe. But, as their deployments are extended and hostilities increase, our troops also deserve to know our exit strategy. Even after the June 30 transfer of power, 135,000 troops will remain on the ground, in the words of General Myers, ''for the foreseeable future.''

There's no question that America can't cut and run, but the American people ought to know what lies ahead and at what cost. We've spent $166 billion thus far in Iraq without any clear strategy. Earlier this year, the administration said they didn't need any money. The President didn't account for anything in his budget. Now, they say they only need $25 billion.

But, if you tally up what will be required for over the coming year, this just isn't enough. When you consider the over $4 billion we spend each month and the cost of replenishing needed equipment, the price tag is closer to $66 billion. I'm not sure how any American can be confident that we're really being told what is required. Yet, it is clear that we can no longer shoulder this effort alone and must move to share the responsibility with our major allies.

Even as Republicans move forward to authorize this $25 billion for Iraq, they refuse to accept quality of life and force protection initiatives to help our troops. They refused to allow an amendment providing targeted pay raises to retain our forces. They shot down funding to test countermeasures to improvised explosive devices that continue to take the lives and limbs of our troops in Iraq. And they dismissed a proposal to provide free life insurance for soldiers serving in harms way.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this wasteful and irresponsible bill. It is time we had a defense budget that lives within its means, an accounting for what is truly required in Iraq, and the best possible support we can provide our troops.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address provisions contained in section 2841 of H.R. 4200 that authorizes a transfer of 38 acres in the District of Columbia from the Department of Navy to the General Services Administration for the purpose of housing the Department of Homeland Security at the Navy Complex on Nebraska Ave.

First let me say I support the commitment of the Department of Homeland Security to remain in the District of Columbia and commend Secretary Ridge for his personal involvement in this decision. Since the Department was created two years ago I have worked with both the Department and the General Services Administration to identify suitable space in the District to house the new department, and am delighted that for now and until the Transportation Committee reviews and approves its housing plans, they will be housed at the Naval Complex on Nebraska Ave.

However, I do have objections, and these are bi-partisan objections shared with my colleagues on the Transportation Committee, about authority contained in section 2841 that transfers the Naval property into the GSA inventory.

Section 2841 transfers the property to the General Services Administration using the phrase ''administrative jurisdiction,'' rather than the more traditional and routinely used phrase ''custody and control.''

Mr. Chairman, by way of background, officials from the White House, Office of Management and Budget, The Department of Homeland Security, General Services Administration and the Navy agreed to a three step approach whereby: (1) the Nebraska Ave. Complex would be transferred to GSA; (2) GSA would lease the space to Homeland Security; and (3) the Navy would be made whole for the expenses associated with its move from the site. In fact in February of this year these officials met with Transportation Committee staff, on a bi-partisan basis, to review the details of this approach.

This provision reflects that approach, except that the property should be transferred to the full custody and control of the Administrator of GSA. The reason for this change is quite simple. According to GSA's lawyers, administrative jurisdiction is undefined and thus open to interpretation regarding the bundle of rights and responsibilities associated with use and ownership of property in the GSA inventory. Such uncertainties associated with the transfer of responsibility for property inevitably lead to delays based on different legal interpretations and often to litigation.

For example, the ability of GSA to operate, maintain, and protect buildings is for buildings under the custody and control of the Administrator, but the ability to perform these activities is unclear for facilities under administrative jurisdiction. Further, the ability to assign and reassign space is for those buildings under the custody and control of the Administrator, but it is unclear that the Administrator would preserve the complex for federal purposes under ''administrate jurisdiction.'' Finally, the application of NEPA and historic preservation provisions are unambiguous for buildings under the custody and control of the Administrator but would not apply for buildings under the administrative jurisdiction.

Needless to say, a simple remedy of inserting ''custody and control'' will clarify any use or ownership circumstances that could affect these 38 valuable acres in my District.

My staff has been working with staff from the House Armed Services Committee on a freestanding bill that will make this section obsolete. On a bi-partisan basis, we believe there is a way to deal with this issue. Once we reach agreement on appropriate and legally sufficient language we hope this agreement will be reflected in the DOD conference report.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, today, our nation is at war—a war that should never have been started, a war without an exit strategy, a war without allies, and a war I will continue to oppose. Congress ought to be debating these issues—now! But what is not debatable is the fact that all of us in Congress support our dedicated men and women serving in harm's way.

This bill is not perfect—and includes many very bad provisions. This hulking bill, authorizing well over half of our nation's spending every year, has often been the culprit in funding dangerous cost overruns and government spending waste.

Just like last year's Defense Authorization bill, this bill authorizes previously prohibited research on low-yield nuclear weapons. The bill also authorizes $28 million to study the feasibility of developing a high-yield, earth penetrating nuclear weapon to destroy hardened and deeply buried targets.

Another troubling provision is the approval of the administration's request of $10.2 billion for ballistic missile defense programs—$1.1 billion, or 13 percent more than the current level. The total includes funding for the initial deployment of a national missile defense system based in Alaska and California. In today's world of terrorist cells scattered around the globe, this $10.2 billion expenditure is a wasteful boondoggle left over from another time.

There were many good provisions that the Republican Leadership would not even allow the People's House to debate and vote on. These Democratic amendments related to the war in Iraq, and dealt with important issues, such as why money is going to the Iraqi National Congress despite repeatedly bad intelligence from them, affirmations of the Geneva Convention and training requirements, support for Reserves and National Guard, and the need for greater international military support. Shutting out a full debate on these issues is a great failing of this bill.

Possibly most troubling is the lack of oversight Congress is exercising in this bill. Since the spring of 2003, Congress has appropriated more than $166 billion for the war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the last supplemental measure, the administration had been claiming additional funds would not be needed until next year. Unbelievably, the President's FY 2005 defense authorization request, in fact, contained no money for Iraq operations.

However, the worsening situation in Iraq forced the White House last week to ask for an additional $25 billion for operations there this year—and the Armed Services Committee authorized the funding with little discussion on the floor.

In essence, the President of the United States hasn't been honest with either the Congress or the American people about what this war is costing, and what funding he needs in the months, and potentially years, to come. The Congress missed a golden opportunity to discuss and debate the substance of the nation's deepening descent into Iraqmire.

Despite these shortcomings, the bill contains many important provisions that are essential to our soldier's serving in combat. I strongly support the 3.5 percent across-the-board pay raise, special pay and bonuses for reservists and active duty personnel, and improved housing provisions. The bill also includes an authorization for additional body armor and armored Humvees, which have been, tragically, in short supply over the last year in Iraq.

I am very happy that after many of us have struggled for years to end the Survivor Benefit Penalty, the Republican Leadership has finally relented in this bill. Democrats have worked with veterans' and military officers' organizations to press for the elimination of the social security offset under the SBP by increasing the annuities paid to survivors of military retirees who are 62 or older from 35 percent of retired pay to 55 percent. This is a major victory for our nation's military retirees and their spouses.

In addition, this bill contains a 2-year delay of the Base Realignment and Closure process (BRAG), which I strongly support. This delay in the BRAC process is important to all of us in San Diego, and we all need to stand up to the President's desire to complete the next round of base closings as soon as possible. I hope the final bill stands up to the Presidential blustering threats of veto.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill because it keeps faith with our men and women in uniform, serving in combat halfway around the world.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill we are considering today. A major issue of concern is the additional $25 billion authorized for military operations in Iraq gives the Pentagon a blank check to spend the money as it sees fit. The Secretary of Defense wants unfettered flexibility in the disposition of these funds free from Congressional oversight. As Bob Woodward's book details, the administration cannot be trusted to seek Congressional approval to reprogram resources. The administration secretly moved approximately $200 million out of Afghanistan operations into Iraq war planning in 2002 without the approval of Congress. There must be more Congressional oversight in this $422 billion bill.

Additionally, I am, frankly, disappointed in the work of the House Armed Services Committee to address several key issues, especially the lack of attention given to the problem of sexual assault and abuse within military circles. I appreciate the efforts of Representatives SKELTON and SLAUGHTER to make improvements in this area, but I think we could have done better.

This measure allows the Pentagon to continue to do business as usual. I find that unacceptable; therefore, I cast my vote against this measure. I am hopeful that a better bill will emerge from conference when the House meets with the other body to iron out a compromise agreement.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have strong reservations about this bill, but I will support it.

We are three years into our war on terrorism and still engaged in military action in Iraq and Afghanistan. There is no doubt that we must continue to focus on defending our homeland against terrorism, we must support our military personnel, and we must give our military the training, equipment, and weapons it needs to beat terrorism around the world.

In particular, we must respond to the needs of our men and women in uniform in Iraq as they struggle against a persistent and dangerous insurgency with too few troops and inadequate supplies.

That's why I'm in favor of increasing protection for our troops in Iraq through funding provided in the bill for expedited production of armored Humvees, body armor, and armored trucks. And I'm also in favor of provisions in the bill authorizing the largest increase in military end-strength in decades—increasing active duty Army by 30,000 personnel and the Marine Corps by 9,000. Our army is overstretched, and we can't and shouldn't continue to rely on National Guard, reservists, and private contractors to fill in the gaps. I'm pleased also that the bill includes provisions—such as the continuing extension of TRICARE coverage—to ease the particular hardships that our campaign in Iraq has

The bill includes provisions authorizing $25 billion in response to the president's most recent supplemental budget request for the war in Iraq. The costs of our Iraq mission continue to skyrocket, adding to our ballooning federal deficit and shortchanging domestic programs. But these costs must be paid. So I am encouraged that this bill doesn't give the president a blank check. Instead, it breaks down the $25 billion and specifies that certain amounts be spent on operations and maintenance, personnel, and weapons procurement.

I support the BRAC provisions in the bill. BRAC is an important process that has the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. But no process should go forward blindly, without taking into account changing facts on the ground. In my view, given the uncertainty of the current wartime environment, it makes sense to give Congress time to consider what resources our military might need in the future. We are still making decisions regarding the number of troops needed in Europe and Asia and where they should be located. Many of them may return to the U.S. This bill itself increases troop strength by 39,000—and it isn't clear how this increased end-strength will figure in to the next BRAC round. The Department of Defense is still completing its global posture review, yet as reported by CongressDaily recently, DoD officials have no plans to share the review with Congress. Yet that review no doubt informs the BRAC process in ways that Congress needs to understand.

So I think it's important for Congress to have a year to review reports from DoD on its global basing strategy and its infrastructure needs.

I'm also in favor of provisions in the bill establishing new rules for the interrogation of prisoners and commending the actions of Joseph Darby, the brave soldier who first notified authorities of the prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib prison.

The bill also provides for our men and women in uniform an across-the-board pay increase of 3.5 percent, boosts military special pay and extends bonuses, and funds programs to improve living and working facilities on military installations. These are all necessary and important provisions that I support.

I do have a number of serious reservations about the bill.

I don't believe it addresses 21st century threats as well as it could. With the exception of the Crusader artillery system and the Comanche helicopter, the Administration and Congress have continued every major weapons system inherited from previous administrations. So although the bill brings overall defense spending to levels 18 percent higher than the average Cold War levels, it doesn't present a coherent vision of how to realign our defense priorities.

I am strongly opposed to the authorization of $10 billion to deploy a missile defense system that doesn't work and that wouldn't protect against the terrorist threats that we face today.

And I'm strongly opposed to the funding provided in the bill to study the feasibility of developing nuclear earth-penetrating weapons and to authorize previously prohibited research on low-yield nuclear weapons. Low-yield nuclear weapons have an explosive yield of five kilotons or less—"only" a third of the explosive yield of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Our obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) require the United States to work towards nuclear disarmament, rather than further increase the size and diversity of our arsenal. By continuing the development of new U.S. nuclear weapons at the same time that we are trying to convince other nations to forego obtaining such weapons, we undermine our credibility in the fight to stop nuclear proliferation.

I also was disappointed in the way the bill was handled here on the floor of the House.

Not only was inadequate time allowed for debating this important and far-reaching measure, the House was prevented from even considering amendments on some aspects of the bill—such as the missile defense system—or was able only to consider amendments that were too narrow in scope.

An example of the latter is the amendment by my friend from Tennessee, Mr. WAMP.

The Wamp amendment is well-intentioned, and by itself it would do no harm. So, it is not surprising that it was adopted by a voice vote. However, I am concerned that adoption of the amendment may send the wrong signal to the Administration and to the Cold War warriors it is supposed to help.

The amendment would change one small part of the compensation program established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act (EEOICPA).

Originally enacted as part of the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Authorization Act, that compensation program is split into two parts.

One is administered by the Department of Labor for workers exposed to radiation, beryllium and silica. It has worked fairly well—something that can't be said about the second part.

The second part, commonly referred to as Subtitle D, is administered by the Department of Energy and covers workers exposed to radiation, and other toxic hazards.

Under Subtitle D, DOE is required to use physicians panels to evaluate whether an illness is work related, and relies upon state workers' compensation programs to assure payments for wage loss and medical benefits.

The Wamp amendment would fine-tune the way the physicians' panels work and smooth the linkage to state workers' compensation programs.

But these are marginal changes at best—and they would do nothing to fix the most serious problem with Subpart D.

That problem is that, by DOE's own admission, for too many people Subpart D simply will not work.

In fact, as many as 50 percent of claimants may find that even if a physicians panel finds their illness is covered, there is no ''willing payer'' that will follow through by providing compensation. Colorado is one of the states where this can happen, along with Ohio, Iowa, Alaska, Kentucky, Missouri, and other states.

The GAO recognizes this ''willing payer'' issue is one that cannot be ignored. The federal government should not make compensation under the program depend on geography. EEOICPA needs to be amended to make sure that doesn't happen.

Furthermore, so far DOE has processed fewer than 2 percent of its caseload under Subpart D. In fact, I am told that as of March of this year, there were approximately 22,000 claims pending—and only ONE had been paid, even though DOE had spent approximately $50 million to administer this part of the law. On the other hand, the Department of Labor has processed 97 percent of its 52,000 claims it has received and issued over $825 million in payments and medical benefits.

The Wamp amendment well might improve DOE's claims processing—which certainly need improving. But it will not guarantee payments for meritorious claims in Colorado and other states across the nation. Too many of our cold war veterans are headed down a dead end street. Speeding the trip isn't the answer—we need to change the route.

The Wamp amendment won't do that. That was why I hoped the House would have been able to consider the amendment filed by my friend from Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND.

The Strickland amendment would have required the President to submit to Congress a proposal for legislation to establish a Federal payer for Subpart D claims, if legislation to solve the problem is not enacted during this Session of Congress.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership did not allow the House to even consider that amendment, just as they refused to permit consideration of the amendment I filed with my colleague from Colorado, Mr. BEAUPREZ.

The purpose of our amendment was to help some people who worked at DOE's Rocky Flats nuclear-weapons plant.

Some of them are suffering from cancer or other conditions because they were exposed to radiation or other hazards while they were working there. So they are covered by the EEOICPA program.

For those who worked at most sites, coverage requires a finding that their condition is as likely as not to have resulted from on-the-job exposure. That's a reasonable requirement—provided there is adequate documentation of exposures. But, unfortunately, over the years there were serious problems with the way DOE kept records at Rocky Flats. So, as things stand now, there is a real risk that many Rocky Flats workers who should be covered will not get coverage in time to benefit from it, because their claims are tied up in red tape.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, despite my concerns and disappointments, I do think enactment of this bill will help support our men and women in uniform and help them win the peace in Iraq and to defeat terrorism in Afghanistan. And, while in my view Congress was wrong to allow the president to rush us into war in Iraq, I think it now is imperative to provide our men and women in uniform with what they need.

So I will support this bill today.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, because it contains a number of provisions that I support that will address the needs of the brave men and women serving on the front lines in Iraq, as well as the needs of our dedicated members of the civil service here at home.

This bill includes much needed increases in separation allowance and combat pay for troops that are deployed in combat. It also includes provisions that will greatly improve the A–76 process, which governs competitions between the private sector and federal employees. These provisions will ensure, among other things, that federal employees are permitted to compete for their jobs before they are outsourced to the private sector and will give them the same legal rights as contractors enjoy. These are important protections that I strongly support.

However, I have a number of concerns with other provisions in the bill, and believe it should have gone further than it does in some areas.

Iraq is fast becoming a hall of mirrors. When the Administration says conditions are getting better, they are probably getting worse. When the Administration says they have a plan, they usually don't. And when the Administration says they are trying to build an international coalition, they may actually be further alienating our allies.

We can add another contradiction to this list: When the Administration says they will closely scrutinize the work of private contractors in Iraq, what they mean is that they have given the contractors a virtual blank check.

The Coalition Provisional Authority has identified over 2,000 specific reconstruction projects in Iraq. The contracts to perform this work should be bid competitively, so that market forces would dictate the costs to taxpayers. But under the Administration's approach, not a single one of the 2,000 reconstruction projects will be awarded on the basis of competition. Instead, they will all be performed on a cost-plus basis by large private contractors who have been awarded monopolies over large sectors of the reconstruction effort.

The public wonders why unsupervised private contractors would be allowed to interrogate and abuse prisoners in Abu Ghraib . . . how Halliburton could be allowed to charge inflated prices for gasoline and to submit bills for millions of meals it never served . . . and why there is so little to show for the billions that the Administration has spent on the reconstruction effort.

There is one answer to all of these questions: whether by design or incompetence, the Administration is failing in its responsibility to oversee the reconstruction effort and to protect the taxpayer from waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under these circumstances, aggressive and impartial oversight is obviously crucial. Yet as I and others described in a report released yesterday, the Administration has outsourced this essential oversight responsibility to private contractors who have significant conflicts of interest.

While Parsons is supposed to oversee Fluor's electricity work in Iraq, Parsons and Fluor have a huge $2.6 billion joint venture in Kazakhstan. CH2M Hill has been permitted to oversee the Iraq work of Washington Group International, Fluor, and AMEC even though it has existing contractual relationships with all three companies in the United States. Parsons is even in a position to benefit its own reconstruction efforts through the use of its oversight powers.

This is an unacceptable situation that I would have liked to address with an amendment to this bill. Unfortunately, it was not made in order.

Another way to ensure vigorous congressional oversight of the Iraqi reconstruction efforts would be to require the Defense Department to provide contract information to both the chair and ranking members of committees with jurisdiction.

For months I have attempted to obtain information from the Administration about the contracting in Iraq. For the most part, the Administration has a poor record of complying with these requests.

I have written four letters to the White House requesting information about the inflated prices Halliburton was charging to import gasoline into Iraq under a sole source, IDIQ contract from the Army Corps of Engineers. The only responses they received were two nearly identical, two-paragraph letters from Condoleezza Rice saying that Pentagon auditors are investigating the overcharges.

The White House hasn't offered any justification for Halliburton's $2.64 per gallon price of gasoline from Kuwait. The White House hasn't turned over task orders or invoices for the gasoline importation work either.

It's not just the White House. I've also written to Secretary Rumsfeld to request information about Halliburton's subcontractors and the process by which they were selected. I sought basic documents, like the subcontracts themselves and the bid proposals from potential subcontractors. Over five months have passed, but the Defense Department has not produced any of the requested documents.

Under the bill, the Department is required to respond to a request from the Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee. That is a start. I would have liked to offer an amendment to also require the Department to respond to the Government Reform Committee, which has government-wide jurisdiction over contracting issues. But again, unfortunately, the amendment was not made in order.

One of the reasons events are not going well in Iraq is that there has not been enough accountability and oversight by this House. No one was held accountable for the Administration's false claim that Iraq attempted to obtain

uranium from Niger or misleading claims about Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction. While we all agree that the abuse and torture of Iraqi detainees at the Abu Ghraib prison is completely unacceptable and universally condemn this illegal and inhumane misconduct, the House has yet to fully investigate this terrible episode.

Today, I offered a procedural motion to express the sense of the House of Representatives that a select committee should immediately be established to investigate the treatment of detainees held by the Administration in connection with the global war on terrorism. A select committee is necessary because this House has ignored its constitutional responsibility for holding the Administration accountable. Time and time again, the Republican leadership has demonstrated that it has no interest in performing any serious oversight of the Administration. I am disappointed that the motion failed by a vote of 202–224.

There are other troubling elements of this bill that I do not support. I staunchly oppose the more than $10 billion authorized for ballistic missile programs plagued by massive cost overruns and consistent failures in testing. I also oppose other wasteful programs like the $4.2 billion included for the F/A–22 Raptor, a fighter aircraft best known for its technical difficulties, questionable utility, and unprecedented price-tag of between $200 to $300 million per plane. I find it most disturbing that the bill also allows continued research for the development of low-yield nuclear weapons for deployment in combat and directs $36 million to research the feasibility of an earth-penetrating nuclear weapon that existing research shows is more likely to spread contamination than destroy its target.

The Bush Administration's quest for usable nuclear weapons contravenes the basic principle of nuclear deterrence and threatens to undermine decades of U.S. leadership nonproliferation efforts. Together with the doctrine of pre-emption and the President's policy endorsing the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states, the effort sends the wrong message at a time when we are trying to get the international community to help us challenge proliferation in North Korea and Iran.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill signals the beginning of a different approach from Congress in dealing with Defense Authorization. I'm pleased that there is at least some money for Iraq, with some instructions on how it's to be spent rather than relying exclusively on the discretion of the administration. It is encouraging that more attention is given to the specific needs of our men and women on the ground in Iraq. It's unfortunate that despite hundreds of billions of dollars authorized in previous bills, not enough has made it to our troops for essential things that they need.

The bill continues to spend too much money on the wrong things. The most graphic example is the 13 percent increase for missile defense; $10.2 billion that's critically needed in other areas of homeland security and defense activities.

One other area I take strong exception to is delaying the next round of base closings. Base closings have historically been highly controversial and political, and Congress was unable to deal with it until we had a BRAG process that helped to de-politicize the process. This bill represents an unfortunate step backwards placing politics over economic or military concerns. We continue to have inventory left over from a bygone era of defense needs that is far more than is necessary. It doesn't speak to today's demands, to say nothing of where we're going to be in the future. We have to be able to close and realign military facilities.

Part of the reason that people are upset when a military base is closed is that we do a terrible job of transitioning what can be extraordinarily valuable resources back to the community. If we were to clean them up and recycle them in a way that helped the environment, local governments, and local enterprises, there would be much less reticence. Unfortunately, we hamper communities by not providing the resources or guidance to bring these lands back to productive use. Simply delaying the next round of BRAG closures gives us the worst of both worlds. We have an inappropriate inventory of facilities, and we do nothing to speed the transition that could help everyone—the taxpayers, the military, and the local communities in which they're located.

I am disappointed that my amendment to help the Department of Defense return former military bases back to local communities was not made in order. My amendment would have codified a recommendation by the Defense Science Board, issued in November, 2003, to implement a national Wide Area Assessment for unexploded ordnance (UXO). This assessment would enable the Department to determine the extent of UXO contamination and help restore at least 8 million acres of potentially contaminated sites scattered throughout the country.

This is the largest and arguably the most important authorization Congress takes up each year. It helps shape the largest single federal expenditure. I long for the day when there is a full and open debate and when there's a way to right-size and re-direct these funds. Never has the need been greater. It's unfortunate that this bill continues to miss the mark.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the provision in the FY 2005 Defense Authorization Bill that would finally end the Survivor Benefit Penalty (SBP), a reduction in survivor benefits when a beneficiary reaches age 62. I have heard from many veterans and military families among my constituents who have waited for too long to end this discriminatory policy. Members who signed up for SBP in the 1970s were led to believe they were purchasing annuities that would provide their surviving spouses 55 percent of retired pay for life. After paying decades of premiums, they understandably feel betrayed upon learning that their benefit drops by more than one-third when they reach age 62. To make matters worse, the U.S. Defense Department Actuary has confirmed that the federal subsidy has dropped to 19 percent—far below the 40 percent level Congress intended when the program was first enacted. There could be no more effective way for the Federal government to restore the intended cost-sharing relationship than by raising the age-62 SBP annuity.

I have been a long-standing cosponsor of two free-standing bipartisan bills, H.R. 548 and H.R. 3763, to make this change in the law and eliminate this penalty as quickly as affordable. Unfortunately, these bills remained stuck in committee until a discharge petition was filed a few weeks ago to bring this matter to a vote. I was happy to co-sign that discharge petition, just as I was glad to be one of nearly 170 Democrats in this House to co-sign the letter sent to Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, urging that this provision be included in this bill. Now we must fight to retain this provision in conference to ensure a 5-year phase-in to finally eliminate this penalty once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose those provisions in the FY 2005 Defense Authorization Bill which authorize an additional $28 million on the nuclear bunker buster, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, plus $9 million for ''advanced concept initiatives.'' The direction in which the Bush Administration is leading our nation on nuclear weapons policy by steadily increasing funding for this type of de-stabilizing research is reckless and ill-advised. That is why I support the amendment offered by my colleagues, U.S. Representatives TAUSCHER, MARKEY, and SPRATT, which would have shifted the funding in this bill away from Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator to increase both U.S. intelligence capabilities to get at hard and deeply buried targets and improved conventional bunker-busting capabilities.

The U.S. Department of Energy, DOE, originally planned to spend $45 million on such research between FY2003 and FY2005. According to the Congressional Research Service, DOE now projects spending $71 million through FY2006.

We should be stepping away from researching new tactical nuclear weapons for new uses, not warming to that proposition. We are sending the wrong message to our allies and potential adversaries around the world. When they see the Bush Administration steadily increasing U.S. spending for this kind of research, they are understandably concerned that the U.S. is opening Pandora's box and encouraging the development and procurement of a new generation of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, this type of research does not make practical, scientific sense.

Supporters of the nuclear bunker buster claim that such weapons would accomplish the destruction of deeply buried targets without causing massive collateral damage. But they ignore some fundamental considerations that are underscored in several recent scientific studies including some by scientists at Princeton University and by the Union of Concerned Scientists.

First, since weapons cannot penetrate very deeply into the ground, then destroying deep hardened targets would require powerful, high-yield nuclear warheads.

Second, it is relatively easy to build a bunker so deep, 1,000 yards underground, that no earth-penetrating nuclear weapons, no matter how large its yield, could destroy such a bunker.

Third, even a small, low-yield earth-penetrating nuclear weapon will create enormous radioactive fallout because the explosion could not be contained underground. The radioactive debris thrown into the air would drift for miles on the wind.

Fourth, there is no guarantee that a nuclear blast would successfully destroy chemical or biological weapons. In fact, a nuclear attack on a bunker that contains chemical or biological weapons could easily lead to the release and spread of those agents.

Fifth, there are conventional alternatives to the use of nuclear bunker busters. Current

precision-guided conventional weapons could instead be used to cut off a bunker's communications, power, and air supply, thus effectively keeping the enemy weapons underground and unusable until U.S. forces could secure them.

Finally, it is very troubling to me that, while Bush administration officials are quick to point out that no funds are authorized in this bill for production of these weapons, it is worth noting that their preferred federal budget plan over the next 5 years outlines spending $485 million to move into the deployment and engineering phases for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of retaining the BRAC language in the Defense Authorization Act for FY 2005. The bill as it currently stands would postpone BRAC for 2 full years, and require the Pentagon to submit reports by certain dates or BRAC will not take place.

The United States military is being stretched thin due to the war against terrorism and the effort to rebuild Iraq. In addition, the Department of Defense, DOD, is currently considering significant realignments of forces in Europe and Asia while it transforms its forces. While I agree that we should evaluate overseas bases first before considering closing domestic bases, for DOD to make irreversible decisions to close or realign military installations before these changes have been fully considered by both DOD and Congress would be an enormous mistake.

Further, the BRAC process is estimated to cost roughly $15 billion with savings not required until 2011. These funds could be used now for more equipment and supplies for our military troops. Make no mistake, our troops will be in Afghanistan and Iraq for a long time. It is our responsibility to provide them with the necessary resources they need for survival. In addition, savings from previous BRAC rounds are almost entirely due to significant reductions in force structure and end-strength. DOD and Congress are not decreasing either of these; instead, we are increasing end-strength by 39,000 over 3 years and considering increases in force structure.

I also continue to be extremely concerned that if the BRAC round in 2005 commences, we will revert back to pre-World War II days when our valuable military assets were located in very few places. The attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 completely crippled our Pacific Fleet. Further, the September 11th attacks are a fresh reminder that our homeland and our military headquarters, the Pentagon, are susceptible to attacks. History tells us we should not push for more base closures and consolidation of our forces.

Finally, as the BRAC process currently stands, Congress is virtually eliminated from the decision-making process. There has been no effort on the part of DOD to work with Congress on basing locations, rotational plans and policies, and overseas and domestic infrastructure requirements which all directly affect BRAC.

Mr. Chairman, since September 11th, the needs of our Nation continue to change. We are constantly reevaluating what resources we will need in the future. When a base is closed, that asset is lost forever to the community it serves and the military. We have fundamental decisions to make about overseas basing, transformation, and major military deployments before we make BRAC decisions. It is my preference that we eliminate this process completely; however, if Congress decides to move forward on another BRAC round, we have only one opportunity to do this right and Congress must be given the opportunity to provide sufficient oversight of the BRAC process. We cannot afford to act hastily. I urge my colleagues to support the BRAC language currently in H.R. 4200.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I support the provision in this bill which would at least postpone the 2005 BRAC Round until 2007.

Since September 11, 2001, the national security and defense needs of our nation have been changing and are still changing. We are still uncertain as to what resources we will need in the future.

First, U.S. troops will remain in Afghanistan and Iraq for an uncertain period of time. Just look at Bosnia and Korea. In fact, after considerable effort to keep Congress from increasing end-strength, DOD is not reducing the number of military personnel in Iraq as planned, and Congress is increasing end-strength by 39,000 over 3 years.

Second, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security is still in the process of being established and the facilities and resources needed for its diverse challenges, including any current military infrastructure that might be needed, are unknown.

Third, difficult decisions are yet to be made about the number of troops needed in Europe and Asia and where they should be located.

Fourth, there are efforts underway to raise or remove the caps on the number of troops in Colombia, and we have 2,500 Marines in Haiti. Similarly, we also see moves to shift at least 3,600 troops from South Korea to Iraq.

Fifth, congressional oversight of the re-deployment and re-positioning of American troops is needed now more than ever. Yet, there has been no structured, deliberate, and timely effort on the part of DOD to work with Congress to prepare our nation to confront additional and unprecedented challenges in the post–9/11 world. In fact, as reported in the National Journal last month, "The department [DOD] has no plans to share the study [global posture review] with Congress, although Pentagon officials say the study will inform the BRAC process."

Sixth, the BRAC process is estimated to cost approximately $15 billion. Savings above the cost of implementing BRAC are not required until 2011. These funds could be used now for our troops now.

Seventh, we are confronting very different circumstances in 2005 compared to the BRAC Rounds conducted in 1988, 1991, 1993 or 1995. Savings from previous BRAC rounds were derived almost entirely from substantial reductions in force structure and end strength. But now, we are increasing end strength and considering increases in force structure.

Mr. Chairman, the following reports are required from DOD between January 1, 2006, and March 15, 2006, or the BRAC process dies:

a. The Pentagon's Integrated Global Basing Strategy, including basing locations, rotational plans and policies, and overseas and domestic infrastructure requirements associated with that strategy;

b. A study of the infrastructure requirements associated with force transformation efforts; a report on infrastructure requirements related to changes to the active and reserve personnel mixtures of the services;

c. A study of the infrastructure requirements resulting from the Secretary of Defense's "10–30–30" objective; a reassessment of excess infrastructure capacity that is based upon infrastructure, facility, and space requirements of current, future, and surged military forces; and

d. A definition of, and infrastructure requirements associated with, "surge requirements" as determined by the Secretary as required by section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

It is prudent for implementation of BRAC to be put off 2 years (1 year if you start at the final due date of the reports) to allow Congress the opportunity and more time to review these reports in light of our nation's evolving defense needs. Realistically, even if Congress was to obtain the reports I've cited during the current BRAC timeline, there would not be enough opportunity for Congress to fully review and debate the merits before we would be required to vote on closure and realignment choices.

We should postpone the 2005 BRAC Round for at least 2 years.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. THOMAS, regarding section 585 of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, and a response from the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
*Washington, DC, May 19, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: I am writing concerning H.R. 4200, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005," which was reported to the House by the House Armed Services Committee on May 14, 2004.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over tax matters. Section 585 of H.R. 4200 allows individuals to donate their frequent traveler miles through the Department of Defense to deployed members of the armed forces and their families. This provision requires an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, we will not take action on this proposal. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4200, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 20, 2004.*

Hon. WILLIAM THOMAS,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 19, 2004 regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to section 585 in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, per your request, your letter and this response will be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman.*

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, Mr. HYDE, regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 19, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the close cooperation between the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on International Relations concerning H.R. 4200, the FY 2005 National Defense Authorization Act. I commend your leadership, and that of Mr. SKELTON, in bringing forward this important bill which will give the courageous men and women of our armed forces what they need to continue to prosecute the war on terrorism successfully.

Further, several of the provisions of Title XIV (in particular, in Subtitle A concerning export controls) amend the Arms Export Control Act, a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations. These provisions will also make an important contribution to our Nation's interests by ensuring that United States weapons systems and technology do not fall into dangerous hands. Two provisions in particular (sections 1401 and 1402) relate to the controls required by United States law over our most significant military technology and clarify that this technology is to be handled with the utmost care. Because of the importance and sensitivity of these areas, it is useful to set forth for the record an explication of several points highlighted in your Committee's report that have figured in the deliberations between our two Committees during consideration of H.R. 4200. Accordingly, when H.R. 4200 is taken up on the Floor for adoption, I ask that you consent to include the full text of this letter in the record, memorializing our discussions on these matters.

SEC. 1401. DEFINITIONS UNDER ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

As the report by the Committee on Armed Services makes clear, the addition of several new definitions to section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) will help ensure that the future administration of United States law in this sensitive area is carried out in accordance with longstanding principles that have safeguarded our Nation's security and foreign policy interests for many years. Of particular importance, the terms ''agent'' and ''exporting agent'' have long been in common usage in the AECA but have lacked precise definitions. This absence appears to have given rise to a recent controversy in which some maintain the term ''agent'' can be construed as any foreign person who has a general association with a foreign government receiving United States defense articles or defense services, such that any (and potentially all) foreign corporations located in the same country could be eligible to receive custody or ownership of, or access to, the United States articles or services without any need to seek the U.S. Government's consent to such a transfer from the foreign government to its private sector. However, such a construction would run counter to well-established principles in our laws. In this respect, section 3(a) of the AECA and section 505(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act are very important. Section 3(a) provides that ''no defense article or defense service shall be sold or leased by the United States Government . . . and no agreement shall be entered into for a cooperative project . . . unless—''(2) the country . . . shall have agreed not to transfer title to, or possession of, any defense article or related training or other defense service . . . to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of that country . . . unless the consent of the President has first been obtained.''

Section 505(a) provides a nearly identical requirement with respect to military assistance provided under Chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act. These provisions (which also provide a legal framework for commercial arms sales and training under section 38 of AECA) ensure that all of the stringencies and safeguards that apply under United States law to a weapons related export also apply equally to any subsequent re-export or retransfer to third parties (including third parties located in the country to which the original export was authorized).

Section 1401 will make abundantly clear that the term ''agent'' must be understood in its classic and commonly understood form, as a person that is specifically authorized by the foreign government to represent its interests (other than an officer or employee, who are presumptively authorized representatives), and one that is subject to the foreign government's supervision and control and for whom the foreign government is responsible (such as an officer or employee). This type of ''agency'' relationship occurs commonly in the foreign military sales program where foreign governments routinely designate freight forwarders and other agents through contractual relationships to receive and transport United States defense articles. Section 1401 accommodates this practice. Similarly, but less frequently, a foreign government may establish an agency relationship with one of its corporations for the purpose of carrying out part of a cooperative agreement it has entered into with the Department of Defense under section 27 of the AECA. Such relationships would still be acknowledged under section 1401, provided that a bona fide agency relationship has been established. On the other hand, this definition is intended to resolve, definitively in favor of longstanding principles in United States law, the recent controversy related to the proposition that any foreign corporation located in a foreign country with which the United States has entered into a cooperative agreement under section 27 of the AECA (or another similar provision in United States law) may be presumed to be an agent provided only that it is a participant at some level in the cooperation (irrespective of whether the foreign corporation is, in fact, a true agent of the foreign government). In such matters, the clear intent of the AECA and the Foreign Assistance Act is that persons who are not specifically authorized agents of the foreign government must be subject to the specific approval of the U.S. Government before United States defense articles or defense services are made available to them, whether by satisfaction of the requirements of section 3, pursuant to issuance of an export license under section 38, or by other statutorily provided means (e.g., U.S. Government approval when such persons are designated as agents in an international agreement to which the United States is a party).

SEC. 1402. EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPORT OF SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT

This provision would amend section 38(b) of the Arms Export Control Act in order to codify the longstanding regulatory practice not to establish exemptions in regulation from the munitions export license requirements of section 38 that apply to commercial defense exports by private U.S. and foreign persons for any defense article that has been designated as ''significant military equipment.'' The President's authority under section 38 has been delegated by Executive Order to the Secretary of State. The regulations that implement the President's authority in this area are the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22 CFR §§120–130). ''Significant military equipment'' (or ''SME,'' as it is commonly referred to) is any defense article required to be so designated on the United States Munitions List, ''for which special export controls are warranted because of the capacity of such articles for substantial military utility or capability'' in accordance with section 47(9)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794(9)(A)). By longstanding practice, an export license has generally been required for the permanent export of any SME defense article or technical data (such as production or manufacturing know-how for SME articles), except in certain areas (described below) pertaining to official use by the Department of Defense and other U.S. Government agencies that section 38(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control itself (as distinct from an exemption established by the President in regulation) specifically declares to be outside the ambit of the export licensing requirements imposed on private U.S. persons.

However, as part of an ongoing process to ''reform'' or relax military export controls, the Committee on International Relations has recently been informed of the State Department's intention to establish a new exemption in regulation available to private U.S. persons for the export of a wide range of cargo, transport and trainer fixed-wing aircraft, as well as certain utility rotary aircraft, to a large number of foreign governments. The aircraft that would be exempt are: C–21, C–22, C–130 Hercules (earlier than J configuration), CT–39, T–1, T–3, T–6, T–34, T–37, T–39, T–41, T–42, T–43, T–44, UH–1 Huey, CH–46, OH–58, and U–27. Most of these aircraft would be eligible for export without a license to any one of the 26 NATO member governments, as well as to Australia, Japan, Austria, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, and those other countries designated as major non-NATO allies under section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act (Israel, Egypt, Republic of Korea, Jordan, Argentina, New Zealand and, prospectively, Pakistan). Some of these aircraft would only be eligible for NATO countries, Australia and Japan. All of these aircraft are designated as SME. Certain of these aircraft (e.g., C–130, T–6, T–37, OH–58 and UH–1) are also ''major defense equipment,'' an additional category of defense articles required to be identified on the Department of Defense's List of Major Defense Equipment. Under section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act, items that are ''major defense equipment'' are those that are both SME and have been designed and developed through major DoD procurement programs (i.e., involving $50 million or more in non-recurring Research and Development or $200 million or more in total production costs).

Section 1402 would bar the establishment of such exemptions for the export of defense articles designated as ''significant military

equipment.'' It is difficult to understand why some apparently believe it is appropriate or timely to relax our military export controls in the midst of the global war on terrorism, least of all over defense articles that fall into the SME category. Under the Arms Export Control Act, these articles are intended to be the subject of ''special export controls'' which historically have included the requirement for the foreign end user to sign a U.S. Government nontransferable and end-use certificate before a license is issued. A further consideration is that the State Department has not yet been able to put into place an adequate system for monitoring and tracking exports of SME that are approved under licenses (let alone exemptions). In this respect, more than four years after the enactment of Public Law 106–113 requiring a quarterly report to Congress of all SME exports licensed under section 38, the State Department has yet to submit its first report. Further, State announced earlier this year that it was deferring implementation of a regulation to require reporting by exporters of technical data and defense services exported under section 38, suggesting that its initial report is not in the immediate offing.

The Committee on International Relations is very sympathetic to the goal of expediting the export of such defense articles to our coalition partners in the war on terrorism (although a list of our coalition partners might not necessarily coincide with the above list of countries drawn up by State). This said, it would be far preferable to establish priorities in the export license process such that our closest coalition partners are placed at the head of the line. In this way, exports involving coalition partners can be processed more securely (without the increased risks of diversion that arise from license exemptions) and more quickly, with licenses issued in a matter of a few days rather than many weeks. Initiatives to relax military export controls when our country is at war, as reflected in such proposals and others which the Committee on International Relations understands may be forthcoming in the context of a new policy to promote defense trade (National Security Policy Directive 19), are inherently inconsistent with the national security interests of our Nation.

By the same measure, section 1402 would not significantly alter the existing regulatory regime in this area. Until now, the principal exceptions to the practice of not exempting SME defense articles from munitions license requirements have not resulted from exemptions established by the President in regulation, but from the express exclusion by Congress when enacting the Arms Export Control Act of certain U.S. Government (chiefly Department of Defense) activities from the ambit of section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act. Section 38(b)(2) of that Act provides that ''. . . no license shall be required for exports or imports made by or for an agency of the United States Government (A) for official use by a department or agency of the United States Government, or (B) for carrying out any foreign assistance or sales program authorized by law and subject to the control of the President by other means (22 USC 2778(b)(2)).'' This provision (section 1402), therefore, does not affect the export of defense articles that are expressly precluded by section 38(b)(2) from export licensing under the Arms Export Control Act, including defense articles that are SME, and without regard to whether they are unclassified or classified (provided, in the latter case, that they are subject to the control and other requirements of applicable United States law and regulation concerning handling and shipments of classified material). Nor does this provision affect any regulatory procedures in place or promulgated in the future to facilitate the import or export of defense articles through U.S. ports of entry and exit that meet the exclusionary standards of section 38(b)(2). Such regulatory procedures do not constitute the establishment of an exemption in regulation by the President, but merely facilitate activities by the Department of Defense and other U.S. Government agencies that have been expressly excluded in law from license requirements by the Congress.

Similarly, section 1402 is not intended to affect the longstanding practice with respect to exports to Canada, where the Congress has also provided an exemption in law in section 38(f)(3) of the AECA with respect to export license requirements. Further, section 1402 is concerned fundamentally with permanent exports and is not intended to impinge on regulatory practice to permit license exemptions, under well-defined conditions relating to ''temporary'' exports under well-defined circumstances by United States defense firms, of significant military equipment for purposes of exhibition and demonstration to friends and allies of the United States.

Thank you for your kind and immediate attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
*Chairman.*

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am pleased to speak in support of the bill before us. I wish to thank Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member SKELTON for their leadership in crafting a bill that will provide our military—and the men and women who serve in it—the resources they need to keep America strong in the 21st century. It is always a daunting task to craft legislation that balances the needs of our services, and such an effort is even more challenging during a time of military conflict. Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member SKELTON have succeeded admirably in this endeavor, and the product before us today is a fine example of careful craftsmanship and bipartisan cooperation. I am particularly appreciative of the Chairman's theme of ''The Year of the Soldier,'' and the commitment this legislation demonstrates to force protection and quality of life enhancements. We are proud of our men and women in uniform, and we must ensure that they are given the resources necessary to succeed in their mission.

I am pleased that the legislation includes provisions that I offered with Congressman JIM COOPER during committee consideration to ensure that civilian employees at the Department of Defense do not lose their jobs to private contractors without first having the opportunity to compete for the work. The legislation closes loopholes that have allowed the Department of Defense to reclassify or reorganize work to avoid Congressionally mandated competition requirements. It also supports efforts to provide civilian employees with comparable legal standing to private-sector workers when appealing contract decisions. These provisions will offer equality to our civilian employees and significant savings to our taxpayers.

I also appreciate the committee's effort to correct the problem of reduced survivor benefits for military spouses. For too long, military spouses have witnessed their survivor benefits drop by more than one-third once reaching the age of 62. Comparable civilian plans provide survivors a lifetime annuity of 50–55 percent of retired pay and protect against a drop in annuity at age 62. As a cosponsor of the Military Survivor Benefits Improvement Act, I have supported efforts to repeal this unfair burden and am pleased that this legislation would restore benefits gradually to 55 percent by March 2008.

As we move forward on this legislation, I hope to work with the Chairman and the Ranking Member to address my concerns about our nation's shipbuilding rates. This legislation would postpone by one year construction of our next-generation destroyer, DD(X), and the Littoral Combat Ship, at a time when our naval fleet is shrinking and our shipbuilding industry is struggling. The proposed $221 million reduction for DD(X) is particularly disconcerting when the project has been running on budget and on schedule. Admiral Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations, has indicated his opposition to these shipbuilding cuts, and I look forward to working with the committee to restore funding for DD(X) and LCS.

Overall, this legislation is a well-balanced approach to the needs of our nation's military, and I commend the Chairman, Ranking Member, and my colleagues on the committee for a fine work product. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, while I do have concerns with this bill, I rise to voice my support for H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. We need to do everything we can to make our armed forces as effective as possible. That's why I support the 2-year delay for the next BRAC round.

California has seen 29 bases close. In the Inland Empire, George and Norton Air Force Bases have been closed. And March Air Force Base was reduced to a reserve base. This cost an estimated 37,000 jobs and $3.9 billion in economic activity. That is 39 times the size of the San Bernardino city budget. That's real money that could have helped our citizens.

The 22,000 citizens of Barstow are worried that the Nebo Marine Corp Logistics Base and Yermo Annex will close. It is the city's second largest employer. What will happen when it closes?

When Norton Air Force Base closed in a previous BRAC round, it devastated my district. We lost 10,000 military and civilian personnel. And thousands more lost their job off the base. We have never been able to replace those jobs. It's not only communities that will be affected. Base closings will affect our troops and their families. It will set the military on a course of instability. All in order to save a few bucks.

Our troops in Iraq should not have to worry whether their families will be moved to another city or another state. They have better things to worry about. Because of these reasons I support the suspension of BRAC.

H.R. 4200 is far from a perfect bill. But it helps to fix the problems the Administration has not dealt with. It makes the military more effective and it protects our communities and troops.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER and the House Armed Services Committee efforts to provide our troops with the equipment necessary to successfully accomplish their missions in the global war on terrorism and Operation Iraqi Freedom, more specifically.

Specifically, the FY05 Defense Authorization bill funds procurement initiatives near-and-dear to my heart, to include full funding for the Up Armor High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled

Vehicle, providing the ability to purchase over 6,000 up armored Humvees, and funding for ballistic armor for other Humvees and trucks, as well as Interceptor Body Armor funding.

Mr. Chairman, this is of particular concern to me since recently I approached the Chairman after several U.S. Army National Guard soldiers from my District in Charlie Company, 2nd Battalion of the 108th Light Infantry were killed and wounded on Easter Sunday during an attack in Samarra, Iraq.

Private First Class Nathan Brown was killed in action after being struck by a rooftop fired RPG while riding in a 5-ton truck.

Armored and up armored vehicles and body armor equipment are not just necessary but required, and it is Congress' job to provide these resources to troops in combat.

The Pentagon must know it is Congress' intent to provide all the tools needed to successfully complete their missions in Iraq and around the world. The message Congress is sending to the bureaucracy that supports our military and the field commanders in theater is the same. Our collective expectation is for the Department of Defense to put this equipment to the best use immediately, in order to allow the men and women on the ground sacrificing their lives to fully succeed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 9 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and amendment No. 25 offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. TAUSCHER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 214, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—204

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

NOES—214

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

NOT VOTING—16

Ballance
Becerra
Burr
Crowley
Deutsch
Doolittle
Fattah
Fossella
Gephardt
Johnson, Sam
LaTourette
Leach
Norwood
Quinn
Tauzin
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1524

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, MCINNIS, BACHUS and POMBO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. PETRI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. RYUN OF KANSAS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25 offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 290, noes 132, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—290

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner

Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Langevin
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—132

Abercrombie
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Boyd
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Emanuel
Evans
Farr
Filner
Ford
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kind
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Manzullo
Marshall
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Weldon (PA)
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Ballance
Becerra
Burr
Deutsch
Fattah
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Quinn
Tauzin
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are left in this vote.

□ 1534

Messrs. ABERCROMBIE, CARDOZA and CROWLEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Are there any more amendments?

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. UPTON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 648, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WAXMAN. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Waxman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4200 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title X (page 409, after line 13), insert the following new section:

**SEC. ___. SENSE OF HOUSE CONCERNING ESTABLISHMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE TO INVESTIGATE THE TREATMENT OF DETAINEES HELD IN CONNECTION WITH THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**

It is the sense of the House of Representatives—

(1) that there should immediately be established, during the 108th Congress, a select committee of the House to investigate the treatment of detainees (both within and outside the United States) who are held in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, or any other operation within the Global War on Terrorism;

(2) that such a select committee should be composed of 10 members, five to be selected by the Speaker and five to be selected by the Democratic leader; and

(3) that such a select committee's investigation should cover, at a minimum, the following:

(A) The treatment of detainees.

(B) The conduct of United States military and civilian personnel operating facilities at which such detainees are held.

(C) The role of any contractor personnel in detention or interrogation activities.

(D) Allegations of abuse at any of those facilities and the response to those allegations by officials at all levels of the United States Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, George Will wrote a column recently about the administration's lack of accountability. He pointed out that no one was held accountable for the administration's false claim that Iraq attempted to obtain uranium from Niger or misleading claims about Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction.

He correctly concluded failures are multiplying because of choices for which no one seems accountable.

We are about to repeat this mistake once again. We all agree that the abuse and torture of Iraqi detainees at the

Abu Ghraib prison is completely unacceptable. Congress has rightly condemned this illegal and inhumane conduct; but this House must take the next step, and fully investigate these terrible episodes. We must determine how many individuals were involved and how far up the chain of command this extends.

We also must find out whether this type of abuse has occurred elsewhere, inside or outside of Iraq. We need to review the role of independent contractors; what role they played, to whom were they accountable. If we do not insist on holding the executive branch accountable, we are creating exactly the same situation George Will described, ''an administration where failures go unpunished and officials need not worry about the consequences of their conduct.''

This motion to recommit would express the sense of the House of Representatives that a select committee of the House should immediately be established to investigate the treatment of detainees held by the administration in connection with the global war on terrorism. A select committee is necessary because this House has ignored its constitutional responsibility for holding the administration accountable.

Time and time again the House majority has demonstrated that it has no interest in performing any serious oversight of this administration. The Republican majority has refused to investigate the alleged White House's outing of CIA agency's Valerie Plame, which might have jeopardized our national security.

The majority has declined to investigate allegations that administration officials threatened to fire the Health and Human Services chief actuary if he disclosed unfavorable cost projections for the Medicare prescription drug benefit to Congress. Now the House majority wants to do as little oversight as possible when it comes to abuse of detainees.

One Republican leader objected to ''jerking those battle field commanders out of Iraq for hearings'' even when these same commanders are on the other side of the Capitol testifying before the Senate.

Another suggested the ''congressional investigations would inflame hatred of the U.S. by providing fodder and soundbites for our enemies.'' Our enemies are already gleeful over the tarnishing of our credibility all around the world as champions of democracy and human rights.

On the floor yesterday we were told that public hearings and some closed meetings amount to a ''massive investigation.'' Well, they seem to think this is all that they need to do; but they have not even brought General Taguba before them. They have not even looked at the issue of the civilian contractors. The majority seems to think that it is unpatriotic to ask tough questions and demand answers.

What do they propose? They propose that the administration investigate itself. Well, this is an administration that does not even acknowledge mistakes, let alone accept responsibility to correct them. It has never found the person responsible in the White House for outing Valerie Plame.

We have never heard any action taken about General William G. Boykin, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for intelligence who made the egregious anti-Muslim statement that this is a Christian holy war against Muslims.

It has never responded to Richard Clark's revelations about what he said about our preparedness for September 12 except to make an all-out assault on his character.

The administration has never told us who told them to write the Iraq-Niger uranium deal in the State of the Union address which was based on bogus information that the CIA told them was bogus. They have never fired anybody for any of these mistakes.

Well, I do not believe it is our constitutional responsibility to let the administration investigate itself. We have a fundamental responsibility to investigate this issue and to assert oversight over the military campaign in Iraq and the global war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, oversight is not unpatriotic. Oversight is our constitutional duty. Now, I know there are different committees of the House that have different jurisdictions on this matter. Let us bring them all together in one select committee. But let us be sure we do the job of oversight. I ask for support for this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) rise in opposition to the motion to recommit?

Mr. HUNTER. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), has made the point that Congress is not investigating. That is simply not true.

Both the Senate and the House, particularly, have held particularly contentious hearings, and the country has seen those hearings because they have been public. But in addition to that, on a frequent basis we have held closed hearings because much of this information is classified. And we ask tough questions in those hearings, Republicans and Democrats together.

But in addition to that, General Antonio Taguba just days after it was discovered, after these events had taken place, was tasked to do an investigation. That was in January. And through January and February and March and April that investigation went forward resulting in something that has become known as the Taguba Report, a report every bit this high with a 58-page summary.

That report and six other military investigations which are still under way have led to a conclusion that this situation is being well taken care of. The conclusion is that there are a few people who committed some horrific acts and that the problem was the result of the collapse of leadership in one battalion, possibly two, and that some misdirected people got out of control.

While this is going on, there is much good going on in the Middle East, in Iraq. Our troops are fighting to secure the peace in support of the CPA. They are fighting to secure important sites, important to economic growth and the welfare of the Iraqi people. They are fighting to build an Iraqi security service, border police, site police, security police and a police force.

□ 1545

They are fighting to secure hospitals and schools. They are fighting to promote local caucuses, to elect local individuals, and they are fighting to control foreign fighters, insurgents if you will.

So there is a big job to do in the Middle East, and I was taken yesterday as I read in the press of another investigation that is ongoing by the 9/11 Commission when they interviewed Rudy Giuliani. Let me conclude with this. This is not an exact quote, but this is the meaning of what Rudy Giuliani said yesterday. He said words to this effect: There is only one enemy in the war on terrorism and it is not us. It is those who attacked us and murdered our loved ones.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) said it well. The interesting thing about this entire mess in Abu Ghraib is the fact that General Sanchez, just 3 days in January after that first soldier came forward, started the investigation on his own. There was no media. There was no CNN out there with an investigative reporter. The general did that on his own, and he then announced to the world in a press conference, kept it secret except for the 50 million people watching television, that we Americans were investigating ourselves over what happened in that prison. He started that investigation and it worked its way on down, and it has now culminated in the first conviction that took place just yesterday in Iraq.

So the military has done well, and we held full blown, full Committee on Armed Services hearings here. They had them obviously in the other body. We have spent more time on this than we have any weapons system, any military operation, and we have done a good job.

We have embedded some of the recommendations that were made in the Taguba report in the bill my colleagues are about ready to pass. We have embedded some of those recommendations. We have made some changes and some reforms in that bill.

Now, it is time to refocus, and let me tell my colleagues why it is time to refocus. In the last 24 hours we have had 66 attacks on American and coalition forces in Iraq. We suffered 14 people wounded. We suffered two KIA. We have to return our focus to this war.

About 3 years ago, we started this very complex and difficult military operation. It has been tough. We have had reluctant allies. We have had tactical problems. We have had enormous challenges, and through all of this, our troops have carried us, our great American troops. They have killed the enemy at 10,000 feet in the high mountains of Afghanistan. They have engaged him in these fierce fire fights in the choke points in Iraq. They have done a wonderful job, and the 300,000-plus Americans who have served honorably and purely in the Afghanistan and Iraq theaters have received almost no publicity.

When Master Sergeant Bill Pryor attacked an enemy position by himself, killing the four people that he took on and killed the last one in hand-to-hand combat, he received no publicity except maybe among a few of his platoon members that he saved. When Gunny Sergeant Jeff Bohr laid down his life by putting his body between his wounded marines and the enemy, he did not appear on any front pages.

We have attended the Abu Ghraib mess with more press coverage than probably any military operation, including the invasion of Normandy. It is time to refocus. Let us refocus on those great and wonderful 2.5 million people that wear the uniform of the United States. We do that by giving them the tools to get the job done, and this bill, put together by Democrats and Republicans, does that. It gets the job done. Please vote ''yes.'' Vote down the motion to recommit and let us move this bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 224, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—202

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

NOES—224

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

NOT VOTING—8

Ballance
Burr
Deutsch
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Tauzin
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1611

Mr. COX changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 391, noes 34, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—391

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley

Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—34

Baldwin
Blumenauer
Capuano
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McDermott
Miller, George
Nadler
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Schakowsky
Serrano
Stark
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—9

Ballance
Burr
Conyers
Deutsch
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Tauzin
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1619

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 4200, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 4200, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross-references, and the table of contents, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I take it we are about to adjourn, and if that is the case, I am wondering if we are adjourning without doing an extension of unemployment insurance?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

## ADDRESSING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2092) to address the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2092

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

**SECTION 1. CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Good health is important to every citizen of the world and access to the highest standards of health information and services is necessary to improve the public health.

(2) Direct and unobstructed participation in international health cooperation forums and programs is beneficial for all parts of the world, especially today with the great potential for the cross-border spread of various infectious diseases such as the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), tuberculosis, and malaria.

(3) Taiwan's population of 23,500,000 people is greater than that of ¾ of the member states already in the World Health Organization (WHO).

(4) Taiwan's achievements in the field of health are substantial, including—

(A) attaining—

(i) 1 of the highest life expectancy levels in Asia; and

(ii) maternal and infant mortality rates comparable to those of western countries;

(B) eradicating such infectious diseases as cholera, smallpox, the plague, and polio; and

(C) providing children with hepatitis B vaccinations.

(5) The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and its counterpart

agencies in Taiwan have enjoyed close collaboration on a wide range of public health issues.

(6) In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and technically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO.

(7) On January 14, 2001, an earthquake, registering between 7.6 and 7.9 on the Richter scale, struck El Salvador. In response, the Taiwanese Government sent 2 rescue teams, consisting of 90 individuals specializing in firefighting, medicine, and civil engineering. The Taiwanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs also donated $200,000 in relief aid to the Salvadoran Government.

(8) The World Health Assembly has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organization, including the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1974, the Order of Malta, and the Holy See in the early 1950's.

(9) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations.

(10) Public Law 106–137 required the Secretary of State to submit a report to Congress on efforts by the executive branch to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations, in particular the WHO.

(11) In light of all benefits that Taiwan's participation in the WHO can bring to the state of health not only in Taiwan, but also regionally and globally, Taiwan and its 23,500,000 people should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the WHO.

(12) On May 11, 2001, President Bush stated in a letter to Senator Murkowski that the United States ''should find opportunities for Taiwan's voice to be heard in international organizations in order to make a contribution, even if membership is not possible'', further stating that the administration ''has focused on finding concrete ways for Taiwan to benefit and contribute to the WHO''.

(13) In his speech made in the World Medical Association on May 14, 2002, Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson announced ''America's work for a healthy world cuts across political lines. That is why my government supports Taiwan's efforts to gain observership status at the World Health Assembly. We know this is a controversial issue, but we do not shrink from taking a public stance on it. The people of Taiwan deserve the same level of public health as citizens of every nation on earth, and we support them in their efforts to achieve it''.

(14) The Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan, in response to an appeal from the United Nations and the United States for resources to control the spread of HIV/AIDS, donated $1,000,000 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria in December 2002.

(15) In 2003, the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) caused 84 deaths in Taiwan.

(16) Avian influenza, commonly known as bird flu, has reemerged in Asia, with strains of the influenza reported by the People's Republic of China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam, and Laos.

(17) The SARS and avian influenza outbreaks illustrate that disease knows no boundaries and emphasize the importance of allowing all people access to the WHO.

(18) As the pace of globalization quickens and the spread of infectious disease accelerates, it is crucial that all people, including the people of Taiwan, be given the opportunity to participate in international health organizations such as the WHO.

(19) The Secretary of Health and Human Services acknowledged during the 2003 World Health Assembly meeting that ''[t]he need for effective public health exists among all peoples''.

(b) PLAN.—The Secretary of State is authorized to—

(1) initiate a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual week-long summit of the World Health Assembly each year in Geneva, Switzerland;

(2) instruct the United States delegation to the World Health Assembly in Geneva to implement that plan; and

(3) introduce a resolution in support of observer status for Taiwan at the summit of the World Health Assembly.

(c) REPORT CONCERNING OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN AT THE SUMMIT OF THE WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than April 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Congress, in unclassified form, describing the United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual week-long summit of the World Health Assembly (WHA) held by the World Health Organization (WHO) in May of each year in Geneva, Switzerland. Each report shall include the following:

(1) An account of the efforts the Secretary of State has made, following the last meeting of the World Health Assembly, to encourage WHO member states to promote Taiwan's bid to obtain observer status.

(2) The steps the Secretary of State will take to endorse and obtain observer status at the next annual meeting of the World Health Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 432) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 432

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 20, 2004, or Friday, May 21, 2004, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, June 1, 2004, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, May 20, 2004, Friday, May 21, 2004, or Saturday, May 22, 2004, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, June 1, 2004, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 193, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—19

Ballance
Burr
Capito
DeMint
Deutsch
English
Greenwood
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Leach
Maloney
Norwood
Owens
Oxley
Tancredo
Tauzin
Walsh
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1640

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3473

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3473.

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

There was no objection.

## CHILD CREDIT PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION ACT OF 2004

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 644, I call up the bill (H.R. 4359) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 644, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 4359 is as follows:

H.R. 4359

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004''.

**SEC. 2. INCREASE IN CHILD TAX CREDIT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to child tax credit) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year with respect to each qualifying child of the taxpayer an amount equal to $1,000.''.

(b) INCREASE IN PHASEOUT THRESHOLDS.—Paragraph (2) of section 24(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(2) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'threshold amount' means $125,000 ($250,000 in the case of a joint return).''.

(c) ACCELERATION OF INCREASE IN REFUNDABLE PORTION OF CREDIT.—Clause (i) of section 24(d)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''(10 percent in the case of taxable years beginning before January 1, 2005)''.

(d) COMBAT PAY TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—Paragraph (1) of section 24(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''For purposes of subparagraph (B), any amount excluded from gross income by reason of section 112 shall be treated as earned income which is taken into account in computing taxable income for the taxable year.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

**SEC. 3. REPEAL OF SUNSET.**

Title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall not apply to the provisions of, and amendments made by, sections 201 and 203 of such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 108–496, if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of legislation to permanently extend the child tax credit to millions of hardworking American families. H.R. 4359, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004, will prevent 30 million American families from being hit with a tax increase next year. The bill before us today will make the $1,000 child credit permanent while enhancing the credit for low-income families, middle-income families, married couples and our military families. As the economy continues to grow, it is important that Congress stand in firm support of policies that strengthen families.

The current credit is a product of the 2001 tax law, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act, which increased the tax credit to $600 per child through 2004, eventually raising it to $1,000 per child by 2010. This tax relief was accelerated in last year's Jobs and Growth tax relief bill which made the $1,000 credit available to families immediately for 2003 and 2004. Today's bill would make this level of relief permanent and enhances the credit by making it more available to lower-income, middle-income and military families.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to making the $1,000 credit permanent, H.R. 4359 also provides for several other tax benefits that Members on both sides of the aisle have sought. The bill increases the level of refundability to 15 percent of earned income above $10,750, a year earlier than provided under current law. Soldiers in combat areas and their families will receive additional support because the bill allows combat pay to be treated as earned income for the credit's refundability. Further, this bill would permanently prevent the child credit from being lost to the Alternative Minimum Tax.

Congress must not allow taxes to be increased on American families just as our economy gets going. This tax credit is good for the American family and good for the American soldier. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important we understand what the issue is here today and where there is a difference. It is not a question of extending the child credit; we favor its extension. It is not a question of accelerating the 15 percent refundability; Democrats support it and urged it before. It is not a question relating to military families; we Democrats have been urging that before and support it now.

So what is the issue here? It is interesting that my colleague from Michigan does not discuss either of the two

major issues. Somehow by using the term ''families,'' there is the notion that major issues can be avoided, that major issues can be skirted, that major issues can somehow be covered up by the use of the term ''families.'' We are not going to let that happen. Whoever is listening must learn the difference here.

Part of it relates, and now I am talking about the differences between the substitute and this bill, to low-income working families. The substitute would provide more benefits because for working families the threshold was indexed. We want to de-index it. That will help 2.5 million working families. We also want to increase the benefit for every family by indexing the credit.

I also now want to point out two additional major differences. This is not only an extension, this is a new tax break. This is not only an extension of this credit, this is a new tax cut. And for whom? It is a tax cut not really only for families earning $110,000 because they receive some of the benefits of the present system. For example, it goes up to $120,000, $130,000, et cetera. For a family of two with $135,000, they get 375 bucks for each child.

□ 1645

So this really goes beyond the present system, one that provides some relief for families up to $150,000 and in some cases beyond, depending on the number of children. Now, what this is, is a new tax break that goes beyond the $150,000, beyond $200,000, beyond $250,000, beyond in some cases $300,000. This is not a tax break mainly for middle-income families. It is a tax break for Members of Congress who have kids 17 and under. Do we need that tax break? I do not think so. I do not think so.

Under the tax legislation that was passed before, the very wealthy families have already received an ample tax break. And if the first chart would be brought forth, I want to refer to it. This is for family household incomes 200 to $500,000: $7,430, this has been the average tax cut in earlier years. And what this bill would do would be to add 2,000 bucks to it. That is what this bill does. Do not call it just an extension. That is point one.

So when I hear, as I heard earlier today, this is for families to buy diapers, to buy toys, to buy a swing, no. I am in favor of providing, and so are Democrats, the extension for families who clearly need it. I am not in favor of a new tax break for families who clearly do not need it, 250,000 bucks a year.

Stand up and say that you are providing a tax break for them. Stand up and say you are providing a tax break for the Members of Congress with kids 17 and under. What this is, is an example of imbalance of priorities and, indeed, of perspective. And to make it worse, you do not pay for it.

I ask that the second chart be brought forth. And I want everybody to understand what the Republican majority is doing here. This tax cut, the way they have tailored it, the estimate is it is going to cost about $228 billion. Of that, close to $70 billion is because of your new tax break. My gosh, you do not even pay for the child credit that makes really good sense. Okay. Should you not at least pay for a tax break for families making 250 and 300,000 bucks a year? That is not just fiscal irresponsibility; that is fiscal madness.

So that is why I rise today and urge support for the substitute and urge that people vote with some perspective, with some sense of priorities, and vote against the Republican majority bill.

It is not going to pass the Senate. I do not even know how you make it in order in the Senate. If this bill had come out of the Committee on Ways and Means, as I understand the rules, there had to be a waiver by rules in order for us to consider it today because it does not come within any budget.

So what we are doing today is in a sense going through the motions, and I am in favor of making clear to low- and increasing numbers of low-income families the need for a child credit. I am in favor of making clear an extension of the child credit for middle-income families in this country. It does not make any sense to dig a deeper fiscal hole for families making 200, 250, $300,000 a year.

I close with this and everybody take notice: what you are doing by giving a tax break to a relatively small number of families, not all of whom but many of whom are earning 175,000, 200,000, $200,000 a year, what you are doing is, in essence, putting a tax on all of the families of America, if not next year, in the future, because they are going to have to pay for the interest on this deep, deep deficit. And you are just adding to it.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means and chairman of the Trade Subcommittee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 4359, legislation that makes permanent the $1,000 child tax credit.

The Bush tax cut of 2003 accelerated the amount of money American working families with children are able to keep, from $600 to $1,000. If we do not act today to make this tax relief permanent, next year working families will end up having to pay $300 more per child in taxes than they did in 2003 and 2004.

In the following years, the Federal Government will take American families on a financial roller coaster ride. In 2005 through 2008, families will continue to see their taxes increased by $300 more per child. In 2009 it will decrease to $200 more. In 2010 they will get the full $1,000 credit, only to have the rug whipped out from under them in the following 2 years when the credit will decrease to $500 per child.

Does this sound confusing? I will boil it down to its simpler form. A vote against this legislation is a vote to increase taxes on American families by $228 billion over 10 years. That is money earned by mothers and fathers who work hard to pay the enormous costs required to keep food on their families' tables and clothes on their families' backs.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4359.

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

I want to point out to the gentleman from Illinois that over 2 million children in Illinois will receive more of a benefit from the Democratic substitute than from the Republican bill and only the very wealthiest 4 percent of the families in Illinois will receive any of the new tax cut that goes beyond the extension of the present system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), an active member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in disbelief that we are even considering such an irresponsible bill today. Instead of taking responsible steps to make permanent a tax cut to help working families with children, this bill balloons our Federal debt and gives thousands of dollars in extra tax breaks to the very wealthiest Americans.

On the other hand, those who need help the most, low- to moderate-income working families with children, receive little benefit under this bill. And those at the very bottom get nothing. That is right, they get nothing.

A family with one parent who works full time at minimum wage earns about $10,300 a year. That struggling family will get no benefit under this unfair bill. A better off, but still low-income, family with two children earning $12,000 will get a one-time $300 tax break. This is only $25 per child or $50 more than they would already receive under current law.

Contrast that with a two-child family earning between $150,000 and $250,000. That family will get $20,000 in extra tax breaks over the next 10 years, $20,000.

This largess comes at a high price indeed. This bill comes with a price tag of $228 billion over 10 years. In fact, when we combine the cost of this bill with the cost of the three other tax bills we have passed over the last month, we are looking at $569 billion worth of tax cuts. That is over half a trillion dollars added to our already incredible debt of $7.2 trillion.

Yes, my colleagues heard me right, $569 billion on top of $7.2 trillion.

This bill is outrageous. It is a sham. It is a shame and a disgrace. What we

are doing today, yet again, is offering huge tax breaks for those who need them least by greatly increasing the debt tax that will burden all of our children and grandchildren for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to tell me how that is fair. The fact is they cannot, and no one can because this bill is not only unfair; it is downright reckless.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time for us to exercise fiscal restraint, but it is never, ever too late to take that first step.

The Democrats, the people on my side of the aisle, we have a better version, a more responsible bill, a more equitable bill, a bill that truly helps those who need it most.

I urge my colleagues to take the first step. Vote against this bill and vote for the Rangel substitute. Our children and our grandchildren deserve better.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to have breakfast with a young man from Nevada this week. He held up his hand and he said, ''I have a baby that was born 2 months premature, and I can hold that baby in my hand just like this.'' And as we talked about his child, who now is well and thriving and feeling wonderful, we talked about the tax credit. This was at breakfast just across the street. He was amazed and appalled and shocked that he would be seeing a $300 tax increase next year because he has a child.

Mr. Speaker, there are 47 million kids across the country not unlike my friend's little baby that he held in his hand a few months ago, 500,000 foster kids, 370,000 children in Nevada alone, who stand to have a tax increase next year if we do not take action today.

Nevada is one of the fastest growing States in the country, close to 5 or 6,000 new residents a month moving into our community. We need 2½ new schools a month because we have about 20,000 new children that could benefit from this tax credit.

We know that the economy is turning around; and because of the strength of the economy, because of the tax credits that we have given in this Congress, right now nationwide there are 1.1 million new jobs since 2003. Unemployment is down to 5.6 percent across the country. Nevada's unemployment rate is 4.4 percent. It is working. Personal income is up. Homeownership is the highest it has ever been, and this is because of these tax credits; and it is because families, working families, have an opportunity to reinvest in their community.

I have been in office a short time as a Member of Congress, but I served in the Nevada legislature as many of the Members have served in legislature, and I will be honest with them, I am perplexed. One of the criticisms I am hearing about this bill to help families is that we have raised the threshold. I am perplexed because I know that politics is the art of bringing groups together and building bridges. The $250,000 threshold was a Democrat proposal just 10 days ago.

□ 1700

I am perplexed that all of a sudden it has become a criticism. We have crossed the aisle and are using their proposal. I encourage the $250,000, and I thank the Democrats for their proposal. Families need permanence in the language.

We also support the Democrat's proposal in helping those families that need help the most by increasing the refundability to 15 percent. I thank my colleagues from across the aisle.

Criticism number three was about not helping military families. Again, I thank my colleagues across the aisle for their language and support of those folks with the combat pay.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to ask our colleagues to support this bill. The economy is getting stronger, men and women are getting back to work, hard-working families are receiving these credits so they can choose what to do with the funds and not the Federal Government.

We have reinvigorated the entrepreneurial spirit across the country. We need to continue with these tax credits, so hard-working families can reinvest the money and take care of their families.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want anyone to be misled by the gentleman from Nevada. The $250,000 figure related to the Alternative Minimum Tax, not to the child credit. The AMT was never intended to apply, except to the very wealthy, and we want to make sure it does not. They have not stepped up to the plate on it.

Also, I want to point out that 400,000 children in Nevada will benefit more from the Democratic substitute than the Republican bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the active and distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, these are very troubling days in the Congress of the United States of America, because we are engaging virtually every day in the easy part of government. It is really easy to come to this floor and spend more money on things that people like, whether it is defense contracts that put people to work, or highway projects that make the traffic flow more easily, or cleanup of toxic waste dumps or more financial aid for colleges and universities. It is easy to do that, and it is great to go home and take credit for it.

It is even easier to stand on the floor of the House and vote to lower people's taxes. There is not a constituent in America that I can think of that does not like to hear us come home and say we just lowered their taxes.

What we are engaging in here is an act of economic malpractice against the people of this country. I heard my friend from Nevada talk about his friend holding his newborn baby. Well, I have two children, and I am going to vote against this bill, because I do not want to send them the bill for the money that we are borrowing to pay for our increased spending and tax cut after tax cut after tax cut.

For every $100 dollars that this government spends, we borrow $30. We borrow $30 for every $100 we spend around here. We borrow it from the Social Security trust fund that is going to run out of money in the next decade, and we borrow it from future taxpayers of this country.

Now, it is very easy to vote for these things today and hand the bill to our children in the future, but it is very wrong. And I hear all this talk about ''job creation.'' We have had tax cuts since 2001. We have lost a net 2.2 million jobs since 2001. I do not think they have worked.

I will tell you what will work. There is a tried and true formula in America. The more money the Federal Government borrows, the higher the interest rates eventually go. The higher the interest rates go, the less economic growth you have. The less economic growth you have, the more jobs you kill. The more deficits you create, the more communities you hurt. We have seen this before. It happened in the 1980s and it was a disaster, and we are doing it again.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to listen to a Republican voice in the wilderness from the other body, Senator MCCAIN, who said yesterday, referring to our Speaker, ''The Speaker is correct that nothing we are called upon to do comes close to matching the heroism of our troops.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from New Jersey will refrain from quoting Senators.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would then paraphrase what the good Senator says.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may or either characterize nor quote the remarks of Senators.

Mr. ANDREWS. I can certainly understand why the Speaker does not want this quote characterized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman that the standard is set in the Rules of the House, not by the Speaker.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this Member of the House believes, and shares this belief with many people in both parties across the country, that it

is reckless and irresponsible at a time of war to be borrowing money to pay to reduce anybody's taxes.

There used to be a time in this country when we had to sacrifice as a country, that everybody was part of that sacrifice. It is shameful that for the purpose of going home and delivering good news, we are borrowing money from our children.

We should oppose this bill and we should support the substitute of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), because it is paid for; and we should stop this economic malpractice against the people of this country.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud that this is the fourth straight week that this House is bringing important tax relief legislation to the floor.

The Child Tax Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004 is another step in the right direction to improve the Tax Code for the benefit of hard-working American families. By making the $1,000 child tax credit permanent, we are sending the right message that we want to help out all taxpayers with the burden of providing for their families and ensuring that they maintain their quality of life.

Last year, the President signed the Jobs and Growth Tax Act into law. Our ailing economy needed bold and decisive action, and this plan was precisely what we needed to make a difference for this Nation. Since the law went into effect last June, the economy has expanded at an average quarterly rate of some 5.5 percent, and we are continuing to see positive signs from the job market.

We all know that families are very busy in today's society with both parents often working to take care of their families, paying for daycare, making mortgage payments in an historically high housing market and trying to make ends meet. This bill, along with all of the other tax cuts that we have provided, will help keep families strong. With traditional marriage and families under attack from so many different sources, including the courts, the entertainment industry and the media, our tax system should not feed them any further.

H.R. 4359 makes sure that the child tax credit does not drop from $1,000 per child to $700 next year, and to $500 by the year 2011. In other words, if this bill is not passed, taxes will increase on children by $300 next year and by $500 per child after 2010. How can we penalize so many American families across this Nation for having children? Shame on every Member of this House if we allow this to happen.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), for introducing this legislation, and the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and the Republican leadership for making sure that we do everything in our power to reduce the tax burden on American families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4359 and to continue to fight for hard-working American taxpayers.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina that about 800,000 children in South Carolina will benefit more from the Democratic alternative than the Republican bill, and that less than 3 percent of the families in the gentleman's State would benefit from the additional $70 billion in tax cuts in the Republican bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege and pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, how historic it would be if we could get back to the idea that tax bills would come out of the tax-writing committee. Every bill that has been coming to the floor has been without the benefit of Republicans and Democrats having an opportunity to evaluate the legislation, to improve on the legislation. At least at a time when our Nation has this polarized war on our hands, would that we could say in the tax-writing committee, we are working together to improve the economy and that we also support our troops, we support Social Security, we support Medicare.

But this is not the case.

There is no basic difference in the thrust of the Republican bill and the Democratic bill. They just would like to make certain that the benefits would go up to people making $329,000. There is no basic difference. They would drive us into debt some $228 billion, because they do not attempt to pay for it.

There is no basic difference, because we are just more concerned with those in the lower income, while they have this fetish, this desire, that no matter how much it costs, they have to make these special appeals to those that have so much.

It would have been that if we were working together, then we could find some equitable solution.

Somewhere on the Republican side, somewhere there is somebody that believes that we should not go deeper into debt. I do not know who it is, I have not met anybody, but there has to be someone that believes that, with the $500 billion in the tax bills we have had.

It would seem to me that the basic principle should include two things: One, this is a time of war. We are spending $4 billion a month because the President has been ordained to bring peace and democracy to this part of the world. He does not know, and neither does Secretary Rumsfeld know, how many months it is going to take in order to pay this cost, not just in human resources, but in dollars.

We have spent over $150 billion, and we are going deeper and deeper in debt. As has been pointed out, we have to pay the interest on that debt. We do not know what it is, besides prescription drugs, that we are going to have to give up. How many schools do we have to give up? How many Social Security payments do we have to give up?

Do we have any obligation at all to legislate today with some consideration for our kids and our grandkids? I do not think so. You have a Committee on the Budget, I guess, because you want to have one. But what impact does it have on the trillions of dollars that we have gone into debt because we want to show the world that we have a fetish in order to give the tax credits and the tax benefits to the top percentage of those people who have such high incomes.

How embarrassed you should be to be able to tell one of your friends and constituents, have I got a surprise for you. I got on the floor of the House and I said, If you make $329,000 a year, net, and you have four kids, I was thinking about you. I was thinking about you on Memorial Day. I was thinking about you when they were looking for more troops to send to Iraq. I was thinking about you and wondering how could I get you to be patriotic enough to know that you can make a sacrifice? But how did it turn out? I am giving you $4,000 to let you know that as Republicans, we care.

You may get some Democrats to support you because they do not want to be against any child credit. But if they only knew how much their children and their grandchildren would be paying for this credit in a nonpolitical year, we would not be doing it, and no responsible Republican would be doing something like this.

This is election year politicking so you can say you voted for the child credit. Your credibility is so shot on the Republican side, they will not believe it anyway. But having said that, God forbid if they should ask one of your candidates, ''and how do you intend to pay for it?'' And paying for it is just not on the Republican agenda. Borrowing is.

So I hope that people will see their way clear to do not just the right thing by working Americans, to give them a break, especially those that have kids, but do the right thing for the country. Do the right thing for the future. Do the right thing for our kids.

How selfish it is for us to be spending everything, reducing taxes, and knowing one day someone may ask us, granddad, what were you doing when they increased the taxes on me so much? Were you one of those people in the Congress that was a part of this?

I, for one, would be able to say ''no.'' I stood up against them. They have had

the majority temporarily, but, God willing, all of this will change and we can get back to some norm. It is nothing I am looking forward to, being in the majority, because we will have the responsibility to be responsible, and when we give tax breaks and social services and education and homes and make Social Security secure and come up with a decent prescription drug bill, we would say, ''And we have to find the money to pay for it.''

□ 1715

That is the only difference between Republicans and Democrats: We pay for what we want to do.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

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

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation of families, and for good reason. The family unit is the foundation of society. And America's future depends on the success of our families. Our jobs as Members of Congress should be to nurture an environment in America where families can flourish and provide and support the opportunity of freedom and the sense of civic virtue that children need to become responsible citizens.

We did the right thing by increasing the child tax credit in 2001. We did the right thing by accelerating that process last year. And now, by making the child tax credit permanent, we ensure that families continue to retain more control over their own money and we enable them to plan for the future, and we give them the freedom to help their children accomplish their dreams.

There are almost a quarter of a million children in my State whose families will benefit if we pass H.R. 4359. But without this legislation, those families will feel the weight of a significantly increased burden next year. In fact, under current law, tax-paying families in Idaho will pay $757 million more in taxes than they did last year. That money should be staying in their pockets. They should continue to enjoy the fruits of their labors, planning for tomorrow's doctors and teachers and scientists and leaders.

This legislation is about creating an environment that enables those families to take care of their own. It is about time we let them take care of their own.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

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

This has got to be a frustrating debate for the American public, these tax bills. It is a frustrating debate for those of us who were for much of what is proposed. It is certainly a frustrating debate for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 4 weeks, our Republican friends have worn their reckless tax cut hearts on their sleeves. That is a pretty harsh phrase. But for those of us who believe we ought to balance America's budget as we ought to balance family budgets, it is nevertheless, I think, accurate.

Republicans have cynically put popular tax legislation on the floor and dared Democrats to oppose it knowing full well that the only reason that many Members on our side of the aisle would cast ''no'' votes against such bills is because they were not paid for, and on the pretense somehow that cutting taxes, cutting revenues, cutting prices, if you will, for what we buy, whether it is defense, education, health care at NIH, CIA agents, FBI investigators, whatever we are buying, you will want to cut the cost and will not pay for it. You want to put it on our national credit card, and you want my kids and your kids and our grandchildren to pay for it.

Very frankly, if this were a Democratic President today making these proposals, there is not a person on your side of the aisle that would not be outraged at the fiscal profligacy, at the fiscal irresponsibility, at the fiscal immorality of the policies that you are pursuing.

I assume you go back to your districts and say, oh, the deficit will take care of itself, just as it did in the 90s. Baloney. What took care of the fiscal deficit in the 90s was a bill that George Bush, the first, had the courage to sign, a bill in 1993 that no Republican voted for in the House or the Senate. And in 1997, in a bipartisan way, we came together and passed a balanced budget amendment for which I voted, and we passed PAYGO, for which most of you voted, which said that PAYGO would apply to spending and to taxes.

You are digging a hole. You are not digging a hole for yourself, though. You are digging a hole for my children, my grandchildren, and all the children and grandchildren in America who are going to have to pay this debt.

I do not get it. I do not get the intellectual disconnect between what you said in the 70s and 80s and 90s and what you are saying today. I do not get it. And you are hoping the American public does not get it either. You are hoping the American public is saying only that I want tax cuts. I want tax cuts. I want tax cuts and to heck with my children.

We are talking about one another. How sad. The deficit is going to be half a trillion dollars this year. When I came to Congress it was $985 billion. Last year we raised the debt limit by $900-plus billion. And yesterday all of you voted, almost all, to increase the debt limit by $670 billion. And how your side of the aisle railed, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has been here long enough to remember that railing, against increasing the debt. How awful that was and we ought to stand up and vote for it.

And what did you do? You hid it by the Hastert rule in your budget because you did not have the courage to stand up and say, these are the policies that I am going to pursue as a Representative of the Congress of the United States.

Democrats are for fixing the marriage penalty. Democrats are for keeping the 10 percent tax bracket. Democrats are for fixing the Alternative Minimum Tax. Democrats are for making the child tax credits permanent. We are for that, and we are for paying for it so that we do not say we are going to fix it. But generations to come, young people, hear me, young people, you are going to pay for it. That is bad policy. That is bad morality.

Let us pass the Democratic alternative, which seeks to be responsible and honest with America and with generations yet to come.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4359. This is about children. It is about families. I think back to when my husband and I raised our children and the tremendous economic pressure on us. I look at that pressure on my children and their husbands and it is enormous. We paid $28,000 for our house. That is not what the kids are out there facing. We paid $2,000 for a car. The kids are having to make payments on houses that are worth more than the cars we bought and the houses we bought.

It is tough to raise a family today. It is very hard to meet the expenses of raising children in a stable, secure environment, saving for their educations and saving for your retirement which is also part of their security. So this is not about digging a hole. This is about setting priorities.

One of my most deeply held priorities is to reshape public policy so that it strengthens families and increases the economic and emotional security of our children. Indeed, one of the things I like about this bill is that it adopts the definition of the middle class that was encompassed in a bill the Democrats offered just 2 weeks ago as part of their effort to shelter more middle-class families from the impact of the Alternative Minimum Tax. I thought that was a good definition. We were impressed by it.

It does expand the definition of the middle class, and this bill reflects that. But you cannot have a tax policy that one year gives a family $1,000 worth of child credit, the next year $700, the next year $500. It is erratic. They have to be able to plan. They have to be able to think through how will we meet the needs of our family.

Making this particular tax credit permanent is important to building a

solid, strong support system under our families. And I rise in strong and proud support of H.R. 4359, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act.

Now, why do I say we are not digging a hole for our children in the budget sense? First of all, I have been here a long time, and I am one of the ones that fought hard to balance the budget in 1997. I was here when we had to dig out of long years of debt. In fact, when we balanced the budget in 1997, it was the first time in 40 years or the first time in 2 generations and we did it right here in this Chamber by disciplined spending. And the result was that as the economy got going, we had a surplus that required us to add just tax policies because we were taking, the estimates were trillions, more out of people's pockets than we needed to fund government services. So we did make changes in tax policy to make the code fairer and more family friendly.

This was one of the most constructive bills, and I am willing to take the responsibility to make this tax credit permanent, and in the future to adjust defense and other spending as we work our way out of Iraq and address priority domestic needs. That is what we did last time. To pass this year's budget, which is a freeze budget on spending, it is going to be tough for us because we do need to increase the funding for public education and to do that, we will have to cut spending in other areas. But I am willing to take responsibility to pass tough budgets year after year, as we will have to, to get to balance. I am willing to do that again and again and to realistically adjust the defense budget as our responsibilities in Iraq decline in the context of new revenues from an expanding economy. And through those mechanisms, to balance the budget.

Again, we showed the grit to do it before the war and a recession. Then had no choice but to allow imbalance. In the future we will have the grit to do it again. But we should not question that grit and fail to fulfill this obligation today, that obligation being to create a predictable, stabilizing tax policy around our young families.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

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

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to this debate, it appears that we have different perspectives about what is important to America. There is no tax relief measure that has ever been passed by this House which has done more good to help the average working family in my district, the 12th District of Georgia, than the child tax credit.

My friend from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) made a quote. He said the $20,000 of tax credit over 10 years was for families earning more than $250,000. Well, he is correct. What he failed to mention is that this assumes you have two children, $1,000 a year for 10 years. If you made $100,000 a year, you would receive the exact same tax credit, $20,000 over 10 years. If you made $50,000 a year you would receive the same tax credit, $20,000 over 10 years. If you make $35,000 a year, which is the average for a small family in my district, you would receive the same tax credit of $20,000 over 10 years.

With a median income for a family of four in my district at $35,000, the child tax credit virtually eliminates all Federal income tax for these families. These families earning that range have children. They need every penny of their income to properly raise their children, and I oppose them having to pay one nickel more.

□ 1700

There are 113,000 children and families in the 12th District, and if we fail to pass this bill, the tax burden on these families will go up by $33.9 million. We must pass and make the child tax credit permanent. If we fail to do this, it will expire and we will, by default, raise taxes across America, the most broad-based tax increase since this body approved the income tax itself in 1913, which was a huge mistake, and we need to fix it.

Mr. Speaker, the child tax credit needs to be made permanent as long as we allow this failed income tax system to continue. I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004. As a member of the tax-writing Committee on Ways and Means, I have been privileged to work on a number of important tax relief measures. However, nothing has done more to reduce the tax burden on middle-class families than the child tax credit. Three years ago, we made a decision to raise the child credit from $500 per child to $1,000 per child. This was good policy 3 years ago, and it is good policy today.

Unless we act, the child credit would drop next year to $700. This will mean an average tax increase of $600 on 30 million Americans with children. Without the congressional action, the child credit would drop again to $500 after 2010. This would result in a tax hike of more than $1,000 on 34 million taxpayers with children.

Many families in my district in northern California, Mr. Speaker, are already having a difficult time making ends meet. Now is not the time to allow for a new tax increase.

The underlying bill also improves the child credit by allowing more families to qualify. Further, the bill makes the credit more valuable to lower-income families and more accessible to military families receiving combat pay.

Mr. Speaker, if we value children and we value families, let us make our Tax Code more family friendly. I urge my colleagues to reject the Democrat substitute and support the underlying bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER).

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is apparent we have three different perspectives on taxes. There is one group, when talking about giving back programs or benefits, that says when we give. Well, that comes from the assumption that the money they are giving is actually their money, like the Congress has this big bank and we are just going to give it away because we are doing good things for the American people. They do not really think this through, that that money comes from working families and the Congress is just the middleman who just kind of passes it along based upon the votes that the majority might get on a particular issue.

There is another group, too, that troubles me in Washington when they look at taxes. First, they look out across the economic landscape and they see people doing something very bad. They are actually making money, you know, it is a terrible thing.

So, first, we are going to regulate it, make sure we kind of slow that pace of making money down. If that does not work, then we are going to tax them and, by George, if they are still moving after we regulate and tax, let us just sue them. It is a three-step recovery plan to keep an American from having anything in their pocket.

There is a third group. We happen to believe that the 52 or 53 percent of Americans who pay all the taxes in this country, who are working families, who work hard every day, ought to have the opportunity to do something radical. If you make money, we think you might ought to get to keep it. I know, that is out there on the edge, but I think we ought to give it a try because going into the future, as we worry about the economic prosperity of this country, this is a country of small businesses, family-owned businesses, people who get up very early in the morning and work hard all day just to pay their taxes, keep the kids in school, keep the car running and keep the blue jeans on. It is not easy.

Will this tax benefit reverse the economic fortunes of our country? No, but I will tell my colleagues what, there are a whole lot fewer dairies in Louisiana and a whole lot less farmers today than there were a decade ago, and it is primarily due to government regulation and taxes.

This may keep some family farm operating. It may keep another dairy

door open, and it may make some small business that we do not know about tonight operate for 3, 4 or 5 years, but let us give it a chance. Let us let people who work, who are the engine of our economy, 52 or 53 percent of all working families pay all the taxes, is it not time we give them a break?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill is, as my colleagues on the other side say, about now and the future, but I think we see it a little bit differently. It is an honest debate, and I would tell my friends that my colleagues on the other side, I believe, feel that if we give tax relief money to people, it just goes down a rat hole; that it does not work; that it is just gone; that it adds to the debt and the deficit. I do not believe that is true.

When we give money to a family, maybe they go out to the store and they buy books or they buy a double egg, double cheese, double fry burger at McDonald's and they pay taxes on that. They pay local, they pay State and they pay Federal taxes, and that money comes back to our coffers for more money to spend. That is called tax relief.

It is not all President Clinton's fault. We are in Congress, we spend money and we make the rules. But right after President Clinton left, we were in a slight recession. We gave tax relief and we had one of the fastest recoveries ever, and we had 9/11. My friend from New York knows the devastation that was in New York City. We spent billions of dollars to fix it. We lost a lot of revenue because a lot of people not only lost their lives but lost jobs there.

Guess what, now that those jobs are coming back, that revenue is coming here. It means more money to spend. We are tying to give them, the same families, more money to spend to come here.

The President and the Congress, bipartisan as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, we want to give tax relief. Those families got that tax money and, guess what, they spent it, and now look what we have today. We have a growing economy. Four and 4½ percent in personal incomes have gone up. We have added over 1.2 million jobs in the last 3 months and it is coming back. So the money is not going down a rat hole. It actually creates money and revenue for us so that we will have more money in the future. This is the difference.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just want to say to the gentleman, this is not about tax relief for people who need money to buy hamburgers or books. You add $60 billion, $8 billion, $70 billion to the debt, in large part for families making $200,000, $250,000.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. CAMP. We have the right to close.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), our very distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the misguided legislation, H.R. 4359.

Mr. Speaker, the current total outstanding national debt of the United States, including intragovernmental holdings, is $7.2 trillion, a $1.7 trillion increase from where it was in 2001. Our budget deficit recently reached an all-time high, and it has increased by $648 billion since 2001.

Our Social Security and Medicare surplus funds have been raided, and our national unemployment rate remains high at 5.6 percent. Our fiscal condition, at best, can be described as a calamity; and now this legislation, H.R. 4359, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act, wants to add to our fiscal woes by catering to wealthy Americans who do not need this particular tax cut.

This legislation will add an unwarranted and unaffordable expansion of the child tax credit for the high-income filers that will cost $69 billion, thus adding to our outstanding debt.

Mr. Speaker, I support a strong national defense and a vigorous program for homeland security, and Mr. Speaker, I especially support making permanent the $1,000 child tax credit, but only for those whose annual incomes do not surpass the existing $110,000 threshold. These families, the ones making $110,000 or less, are the ones who need a permanent $1,000 child tax credit.

If this legislation only provided support for these families, I, too, would have supported it, but it does not. It goes far beyond what is needed and expands the credit to families making up to $250,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4359 is not a middle-class tax cut, as some have attempted to characterize it. I do not know many in America who would consider a married couple making $250,000 a year a middle-class family.

Under this legislation, a married couple with two children would be eligible to receive the $1,000 child tax credit until the couple's income nearly reached $290,000.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4359.

At a time of record budget deficits and in the midst of a war, this action is irresponsible and fiscally dangerous at this time.

For all of these reasons, I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4359.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation makes the child tax credit permanent and enhances it. Without this credit, without action, this credit will decline by $300 or it will raise taxes on families next year if we do not take action.

The enhancements in this legislation increase the level of refundability to 15 percent of earned income at those income levels above $10,750 and it raises that 1 year earlier than under current law.

Our military families have enhanced benefits as a result of this legislation because combat pay is treated as earned income for refundability, and we permanently prevent the child credit from being lost to AMT.

Let me just say something about the Alternative Minimum Tax. A couple of weeks ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle offered an amendment to define the Alternative Minimum Tax to define middle-income taxpayers exactly the same way we have defined them in this legislation. So the enhancement of this credit for those middle-income families is important, but it is something that those on the other side proposed just 2 weeks ago.

Let me lastly say that this is really about strengthening families, and it is interesting to hear the argument on the other side for those who feel that if the government loses money, somehow that is a problem for families. What we say is, no, this money is earned by those families in America and across the country, and if we can do whatever we can to have them keep more of their hard-earned money, that ultimately means not only would their families be doing better, but our economy will do better, and if the economy does better, our government will do better.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4359, the "Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004." Once again the Republicans are giving a new and unnecessary tax break to wealthier Americans at the expense of the hard working middle class. For this reason I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Republican proposal and support the Democratic substitute, which provides real relief for middle-class families and ensures working families benefit for years to come.

Making the child tax credit expansion permanent is one of the best things we can do to provide tax relief for working families. However, the Republicans have made a mockery of this expansion by giving the full credit to families that make $250,000 a year. Members of Congress don't need this tax credit, but under the Republican proposal, many members would qualify for thousands of dollars in new tax credits they do not receive under current law.

No big surprise, the Republicans also don't want to pay for this new tax cut for households making over $110,000 per year. Just yesterday they passed a budget that specifically exempts this and other tax cuts from a requirement that they be paid for. Even Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN said this week

it was fiscally irresponsible to cut taxes given the current status of our domestic and international obligations.

The Democratic substitute is a real solution for working families. Our tax credit expansion is indexed so that the value of the credit keeps pace with inflation and doesn't lose value over time (something the Republican bill ignores). We ensure lower-income families get the benefit of actual money in their pockets by increasing the refundable portion of the credit and lowering the income threshold. Our substitute also refuses to make this credit available to families making over $110,000 per year who don't need it. Finally, we pay for our proposal by asking households making over $1,000,000 to pay a little more.

The Republican bill proposed today gives $70 billion in tax cuts to families in the top 10 percent of income, but does nothing to ensure real low and middle class families get the permanent relief they deserve. The Republican agenda is clear, more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of the majority of hard working American families. My agenda is also clear, I will continue to oppose these unfair, fiscally irresponsible tax cuts that put more money in the pockets of the fat cats while taking it away from those who need it most.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to protest what I consider to be one of the most egregious examples of the reckless fiscal policies that are being pursued relentlessly by those on the other side of the aisle. Today, the majority has decided to distort the child tax credit—a policy intended to help lower- and middle-income families support their children—and twist it into yet another tax break for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, I favor making the existing $1,000 tax credit permanent, and I favor expanding the credit to cover more low-income families. However, I cannot support a policy that would provide a tax credit for families that make more than $300,000, while denying a credit to those with the lowest incomes.

The bill that the majority has proposed today would greatly expand the tax credit for families with incomes between $100,000 and $300,000, but would not allow a low-income family where a parent works full-time, year-round at the minimum wage to receive the credit! The tax credit would remain unavailable to families with incomes below $10,500. Approximately 8 million children are in families with incomes below this amount! Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that those families with incomes below $10,500 are having a much harder time affording the costs of raising a child than are families with incomes of $300,000, and yet this bill does nothing to help them.

Not only would the bill under consideration today provide another tax break to those who do not need one, but it would do so by digging a deeper hole in our federal deficit. Mr. Speaker, the deficit this year is expected to be the largest in history! Yet, this bill would add more than a quarter of a trillion dollars to that deficit—and nearly a third of the cost ($69 billion) is due to the expansion in tax breaks for those with incomes between $110,000 and $300,000.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation at war. We have deficits so large that international organizations like the IMF are warning that the continuation of our fiscal policies threaten to hurt not just the U.S. economy, but the global economy. This is no time to be using borrowed money to give tax breaks to those who do not need them. Mr. Speaker, the legislation under consideration today is a stark reflection of the differences in priorities and values that many of us have with the current tax and economic agenda of the majority.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the objective of child tax credits should be to help families with children who are in need of assistance and to improve tax fairness. This legislation provides little to no help for a single mother making minimum wage, while increasing the income ceiling allowing parents that earn as much as $300,000 per year to receive tax credits.

Low-income working mothers and fathers pay a disproportionately high cost for providing care to their children so that they can earn a wage outside of the home and stay off of welfare assistance. These are the families most in need of a child tax credit, yet, they are the families that are short-changed and left behind by the Republican tax bill.

The money to provide these tax credits for families making well over $100,000 per year is taken from the thin wallets of families making up to $10,000 per year, who receive no benefit from this legislation, and from borrowed funds that will further increase our record deficit. The inequities of this legislation are unconscionable.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of providing a child tax credit. I am supporting the Rangel substitute because it, unlike the underlying bill, is paid for and does not drive our country deeper into debt.

The Democratic substitute, like H.R. 4359, calls for permanent extension of the $1,000 per child credit, but would index the credit for inflation and fully pays for this extension through 2010. It would also accelerate the increase in the refundable portion of the credit, from 10% to 15%, starting in 2004. The Democratic substitute also provides the tax credit to low income individuals—it is simply unfair that they are left out of the child tax credit.

Because the GOP bill proposes no offsets to their version of the expanded and extended child credit, their proposal costs $228 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, today the national debt is largest in history. Americans now collectively owe more than $7 trillion—$24,304 for every man, woman and child. We have borrowed an additional $280 billion so far this year. The Majority would now like to borrow another $228 billion with the passage of this bill. Someone needs to remind them that we are also fighting a war, a war that has already cost us $150 billion and will cost another $4 billion a month.

More tax cuts without offsets will not only jeopardize critical public services now, but will also hurt Americans well into the future. Massive deficits now lead to increases in the debt and will create high interest payments that crowd out spending on public investments for future generations. Moreover, these deep deficits threaten to increase interest rates well into the future, making it harder for Americans to buy homes and afford higher education and making it harder for businesses to raise capital. We are literally squandering the wealth of this country by not paying for our tax cuts. This bill further contributes to a glaring problem—the breathtaking fiscal irresponsibility that is going on here in this town.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the substitute and defeat the $228 billion dollars of debt in the underlining bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support providing tax relief to middle-income Americans and I support permanent extension of tax cuts aimed at helping working American families. However, I am not in favor of a new tax break for families making over $300,000 per year, which is exactly what H.R. 4359 provides, and I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The legislation before us today is a dangerous tax cut Trojan Horse. Disguised as an extension of the child tax credit increase included in the 2001 and 2003 tax cut packages, this bill provides an entirely new tax cut for the wealthiest of Americans by expanding eligibility for this tax cut to families making over $300,000 per year. This more than doubles the previous high point of $110,000 per family where the child tax credit started to phase out, and provides those in the top 10% of income earners over $70 billion in tax cuts.

This is not surprising considering the House leadership decided not to include a child tax credit benefit for working families making between $10,500 and $26,625 during the 2003 tax cut package. By loading on tax breaks for the very wealthy, H.R. 4359 is simply another demonstration of the majority's contempt for working American families.

Further, it is unfair to Americans today, and especially the next generation, to delude ourselves by thinking the record budget deficits facing our nation, estimated by the White House at over $500 billion this year alone, will simply go away. H.R. 4359 as drafted contains no offsets, and will add $288 billion to the budget deficit over the next 10 years at a time when the raid on the Social Security and Medicare Trust funds continues.

As a member of the House Budget Committee, I supported a budget resolution that would have extended the child tax credit at the current levels, while still reducing the deficit. This approach required touch choices, prioritization, and a commitment to helping working families. Unfortunately, this was not the approach taken by the House leadership, putting tax relief for middle-income Americans in jeopardy.

I support the alternative offered today by my colleague Representative LEVIN that fully extends the child tax credit increase for middle-income Americans. It would prevent any tax increase in 2005, and will not increase the budget deficit because it is fully paid for through a responsible offset. Further, it provides more tax relief to more families making up to $110,000 by indexing the child tax credit for inflation—bringing it up to $1,100 by 2009. It also benefits our military families by allowing combat pay to be counted toward the refundable portion of the credit. This approach makes sure that during these difficult economic times, the vast majority of the benefits of the child tax credit help the vast majority of Americans.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support the Levin alternative and reject the new tax break for the wealthiest of Americans. Without the Rangel alternative, this legislation creates more harm than good; it not only increases the budget deficit of today, but also increases the debt of the future at the expense of working families.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership proposal on the child

tax credit is a travesty that puts politics above the well-being of America's children. I strongly support making the $1,000 child tax credit permanent. That tax credit provides important relief to middle and lower income families around the country. But rather than simply extending the existing credit, the Republicans seek to expand the child tax credit to higher income families by adding tens of billions of dollars to the nation's deficit. It is not the Republican leadership that will be left to pay that debt; it is our children and grandchildren. It is incredible that the same Republican leadership that refuses to fully fund the No Child Left Behind Initiative would—under the guise of helping families—add billions of dollars to the debt tax that will have to be paid by future generations.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and myself, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. LEVIN:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. INCREASE IN AND EXPANSION OF CHILD TAX CREDIT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to child tax credit) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year with respect to each qualifying child of the taxpayer an amount equal to $1,000.''.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF CREDIT AMOUNT FOR INFLATION.—Section 24 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT .—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2005, the $1,000 amount contained in subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins,

determined by substituting 'calendar year 2004' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof. Any increase determined under the preceding sentence shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.''.

(c) RESTORATION OF $10,000 THRESHOLD FOR REFUNDABLE PORTION OF CREDIT.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(d) ACCELERATION OF INCREASE IN REFUNDABLE PORTION OF CREDIT.—Clause (i) of section 24(d)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''(10 percent in the case of taxable years beginning before January 1, 2005)''.

(e) COMBAT PAY TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING REFUNDABLE PORTION OF CREDIT.—Paragraph (1) of section 24(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''For purposes of subparagraph (B), any amount excluded from gross income by reason of section 112 shall be treated as earned income which is taken into account in computing taxable income for the taxable year.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

(g) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—Title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall not apply to the provisions of, and amendments made by, sections 201 and 203 of such Act.

**SEC. 2. BENEFITS EXTENSION NOT TO INCREASE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) ADDITIONAL TAX ON HIGH INCOME TAXPAYERS.—In the case of taxable years beginning in calendar year 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, or 2010, the amount determined under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d), as the case may be, shall be increased by 2.75 percent of so much of adjusted gross income as exceeds $1,000,000 in the case of individuals to whom subsection (a) applies ($500,000 in any other case).''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2004.

**SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT CONGRESS BALANCE THE BUDGET WITHOUT USING THE MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this Act and any other provision of law, title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall take effect in the form as originally enacted unless Congress meets the requirements of subsection (b).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Congress meets the requirements of this subsection if—

(1) before September 1, 2010, Congress has enacted comprehensive Federal budget legislation, and

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget certifies in September of 2010 that such legislation—

(A) will result in a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2014, determined by taking in to account the costs of the foregoing provisions of this Act and without taking into account the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, and

(B) will substantially reduce the United States Government's reliance on Foreign central bank purchases of its debt obligations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 644, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a very distinguished colleague and member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

To be sure we are clear, this is a bill to make the child tax credit permanent, to extend it to include families that were not part of the legislation before, those families that are high-income earners.

The other part of this that we have to talk about is the fact that it is $22 billion worth of costs without paying for it.

The first part everyone will agree on. Child tax credit, let us go with it. Second part, increase it or expand it to include families who are among the highest-income earners in this country, we could debate that, but let us do it fiscally responsibly.

The third part, to not pay for it, is the irresponsible part of this legislation.

If my colleagues want to do something to expand the child tax credit at the same time they are making it permanent in the face of what is today a $400 billion deficit for this country, and in the face of, as we have heard other Members say, a $7.2 trillion debt that this Nation has on which we pay close to a quarter of a trillion dollars a year simply in interest, does nothing to give anyone any additional service or benefit, just paying interest.

□ 1745

If we did not have that $17.2 trillion debt, that is about $24,000 for each man, woman, and child in this country today; and if we did not have in this fiscal year a more than $400 billion deficit that we face, that adds to that national debt, then perhaps you could easily talk about extending this to the high-income earners and not paying for the cost of it. But that is not the case.

Today, what is the world like? We have men and women, over 100,000 of them, that have not seen their children, in some cases, for more than a year. We have a Social Security System where people are today contributing for their retirement, where every single cent of the Social Security surplus is being spent and more. We have a situation where more than a million and a half Americans in the last 3½ years have lost their jobs. And those Americans who have been lucky enough in the last few months to regain a job, are finding they are earning less today than in the job they held previously.

So, then, you have to ask yourself, is this truly the direction we want our country to take? Is this the one problem we have to tackle today, increasing the child tax credit to include high-income earning families in America at a cost of expanding the size of the national debt?

And that is where folks on this side of the aisle break. Because we would love to be able to go back to our districts and say, you know what, we just extended the child tax credit, we made it permanent so you can always count on it being there. But you cannot in good faith do that to people who have sons and daughters in Iraq or in a war where we have no exit strategy, where we have already spent more than $166 billion, again not saying how we are paying for it, and what we are doing is adding to the debt.

One of our colleagues from Nevada came to the floor and spoke eloquently just a moment ago about how he held a newborn child in his arms, and he talked about how that child tax credit

will now go to that family because of that child. What he did not say, of course, is that while that child is going to help that family receive, perhaps, if they are lucky enough to qualify, a $1,000 child tax credit, that child is born today with a $2,000 additional debt just from the last four bills that have passed this House in the last month that deal with tax cuts: this child tax credit; the marriage penalty relief; the relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax; and the cut on the 10 percent bottom tax bracket.

If you total all those up and extend them for the 10 years, that is over $1 trillion dollars in cost, unpaid for. So you cannot continue doing this and be realistic, be fiscally responsible, be fair; and we go from there. This is not the way to go. Go with the Democratic substitute.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we have talked at length about where the threshold should be. Just a few days ago, May 5, 2004, my colleague from California voted in favor of an amendment that said that we will eliminate all liability for individual minimum tax for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes at less than $250,000 and above those levels we phase in over $40,000.

It seems to me very hypocritical that just a few days ago our colleagues from across the aisle felt that $290,000 should establish the threshold. And if I can read again from that amendment, it said, in general, the Alternative Minimum Tax to the taxpayer shall be zero, zero, if the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, as determined by this bill, is $290,000.

Mr. Speaker, it seems hypocritical we can use numbers, play with numbers. The important thing is to get people back to work and get people to be able to invest their own hard-earned tax dollars. The economy is improving because of the policy of returning to families their hard-earned dollars.

I again would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and support the original bill as proposed.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Do not keep repeating a big fib. The AMT was not supposed to cover except a small minority of the taxpayers. We did not define a certain amount as middle class. It is not in that legislation.

Do not repeat it. It is not true. This is a child credit. You are adding on to an extension $70 billion in large part, substantial part, for very high-income families beyond $250,000. This is not the AMT; this is the child credit. Get off your big fib.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this substitute, for those who are listening, gives an opportunity for people to do the right thing for working families that deserve some type of tax break for their young kids, that deserve a deduction. Again, the basic difference is do we want to burden the children of the future with the price that we pay for this. We say no.

Can we not think about doing things and providing this type of relief and paying for it? There has to be in this Tax Code that weighs 25 pounds some loopholes that my colleagues can find for the wealthy that you are prepared to say, this is a time of war, this is a time of sacrifice, we just cannot take care of everybody at the same time. Let us start off with those people that work every day. Those families, the kids from the families that are working, that are volunteering, that are in the National Guard, that are in the Reserve, these are the families that really need the help.

When we start getting up there to $300,000 a year, these are not the families from the communities that produce our warriors. It is not me that says that; it is the DOD that says it. The statistics say it. The low- and the middle class are the warriors that are fighting in Iraq. These are the families that deserve the support.

We welcome the fact that our colleagues saw their way clear to make adjustments so that combat pay would not exclude these families from some type of relief. But every time you bring a tax bill, do not drive us deeper and deeper in debt. We support the concept; we just support a better economic basis for the future.

It is so selfish for us to do what we want to do politically this year and leave the burden on the generations thereafter that follow us. As Americans, as Members of Congress, the things that we have to do in terms of national security are not always just guns and planes and the military. It is a sound economic policy so that the future of our great country will not be left in the hands of foreign investors, but in the hands of economists that work with us as Members of Congress to do the responsible thing.

So the reason that we have this substitute is so that we do not deviate from the good intentions of some of our Republican friends, but that we do have a sound economic policy.

Now, my colleagues can talk all they want about the Alternative Minimum Tax. We are not going to attack you on that. You do not have the courage to stand up and talk about the $800 billion it would take to fix it. You are not going to fix it. We tried to give temporary relief. This is designed to create some type of relief for those in the higher income that we say must pay some type of tax. But what you have done is driven the tax burden on these middle-income people, and we tried to give relief.

Let us try not to avoid the fiscal irresponsibility on this bill. Do not talk about the Alternative Minimum Tax. We beg you to bring a bill out to talk about that. Talk about this bill and who gets the relief. And I hope some of the people on the other side of the aisle might say, what does this do to the deficit. Let that be the key question: What is the difference between the bills: Which one is paid for, which one is not paid for, which drives us into the deficit and which one says that we break even because we have closed up loopholes?

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for the opportunity to speak and the way he has managed this bill today. It causes us in the House and on the Committee on Ways and Means to wish we could do some of these debates in committee rather than wait for the Committee on Rules to give us a bill that we have to debate on the floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, Members should oppose this substitute for three simple reasons:

First, just like the sponsors' substitute last week on permanence of the 10 percent bracket, this substitute is only temporary. It is not permanent tax relief. The substitute would cut the child credit in half after 2010, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Here is what that means. The benefits to the lowest income families would disappear. The benefits for our military personnel and their families would disappear. The AMT will gobble up the tax credits, which will drop to $500 per child in 2011 for families.

Second, the substitute does not eliminate the marriage penalty and the child credit, and it does not expand access to the credit for middle-income families. By contrast, our bill, H.R. 4359, will provide the full tax credit to married couples with up to $250,000 in income and for single parents with up to $125,000 in income.

The substitute's advocates are opposed to providing help to these families. And this is really a mystery, since the Democrats were willing to provide these same families with tax relief three separate times in the last 3 weeks. Two of their recent substitutes to other tax bills would have granted AMT relief both to married couples and people in the 10 percent bracket regardless of their income. The Rangel substitute on AMT relief exempted couples with up to $250,000 adjusted gross income, and single taxpayers with up to $125,000 in adjusted gross income from the AMT.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit my friends on the other side simply are not being consistent. They continue to change their definition of middle-class families to suit whatever needs they see at the time.

Finally, a tax increase is used to fund this bill, a 2.75 percent new tax on entrepreneurs. Seventy-five percent of the tax filers that this new tax will strike have business income. The Democrats' approach would raise taxes on small business owners and investors

and undermine the economic growth that tax relief has delivered.

This same tax-and-tax again approach has been rejected twice this May by substantial margins in this House and should be rejected again.

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

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

Look, the 10 percent applied across the board, and so much of it went to families other than the very wealthy. So much of this proposal of yours goes to families that are very wealthy. That is the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), one of the cosponsors of the substitute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), in offering this substitute. Correcting this injustice is something Democrats have been advocating for almost a year now.

It is almost hard to believe a full year after this Congress passed a $350 billion tax cut bill that gave every millionaire in this country a $93,000 break, deliberately leaving behind 6.5 million families with 12 million children in the process, this majority has finally decided it is time to right the wrong done to these families, so long as something is done for the wealthy in return.

During that time, Democrats have come to the floor time and time again imploring this majority to extend the $1,000 child tax credit to those families, a million of whom are military and veterans' families, with 260,000 children of active duty personnel serving today in Afghanistan and in Iraq. We have said that it is a matter of values.

Now, when Republicans finally relent, they do so on the condition that families earning as much as $309,000 also get the credit.

□ 1800

But they do not do anything about capturing any additional people at that lower wage scale; they will not do that. What it also means is a $3.5 billion problem will now add another $69 billion to an exploding deficit, $87 billion if you count the increased interest payments on the extra debt.

To illustrate the profound unfairness of this bill, at the same time that low-income families with two children would get a one-time $300 average tax break under this legislation, two-child families with earnings between $150,000 and $250,000 would receive $20,000 in extra tax breaks over the next 10 years. In my view, particularly at a time when we face deficits as far as the eye can see, it is not only irresponsible; it is immoral.

By contrast, our substitute is simple, to the point, and fair. Not only would it extend the $1,000 tax credit to only the low-income families left out of this bill, hard-working, tax-paying families, yes, they are tax-paying families who need it the most; but it is fully paid for, meaning that it will not add to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that Republicans stop using these families as a bargaining chip for more tax cuts for the wealthy. Do the right thing, support the Rangel-Levin-DeLauro substitute.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, here we are again. For the fourth week in a row, Republicans have put us between a rock and a hard spot, forcing a choice between short-term relief for hard-working families and the long-term interest of future generations. It breaks my heart.

Each one of these votes has broken my heart because I have four adult children. They are families, they each have a spouse, and I have three grandchildren. They would like this short-term relief; but guess what, they know better. They know better than my colleagues do on the other side of the aisle.

It broke my heart to oppose the 10 percent tax bracket, to oppose relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax, and the end of the marriage penalty; and it will break my heart to oppose the child tax credit extension today. But I will oppose it because I know we could do better for our children.

I wanted to vote for tax relief because these bills would help my kids, and it would help the people in my district, but short term. These bills would help short term the four families that I have talked about. Members talk about hard-working families. These kids work around the clock, week in and week out; yet the Republicans are squandering the future of these children and their children. They are providing tax relief for the very wealthiest, and they are providing tax relief in the short term, and I think we can do it better. We will do it without mortgaging the future of our grandchildren with this substitute.

Here are two of my grandchildren. Let me introduce Members to Teddy and his baby sister, Julia. Teddy is 4 and Julia is 9 months old. They have a 16-year-old cousin named Sean, and they have two cousins on the way by year end. I will not ask my grandchildren to pay for their parents' tax relief, nor should you. It is not in their best interest to grow up in a country that cannot afford to properly fund its public schools. It is not in their best interests to work in a Nation crippled by debt. My grandchildren and yours deserve better than that.

The Democratic substitute we are considering today will give both my children and my grandchildren a little extra money, and it will not mortgage the future of the next generation. At first blush, it is troubling to oppose this bill, a bill that would seemingly benefit my own hard-working family. But I am lucky, my constituents and my children understand the hidden price of these tax bills. We understand that tax relief for my children should not come at the expense of Teddy, Julia, Sean, and their cousins we are expecting to be born before the end of year.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is really a sad moment that we are considering this bill, another tax bill, another week. We are really not serious about trying to help American taxpayers or trying to get a budget that makes some sense, that is balanced, that does not mortgage our future, that does not require us to ask our children and grandchildren to pay for what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I would have a little more sympathy for this bill if it was an extension of the current child credit bill that many of us have supported. We think the child credit law makes some sense. But this bill does more than that. I think it is important to point out that this bill would increase the income limits of those who qualify for the child credit. That is an additional tax cut that is being placed in this bill that affects people whose incomes are over $100,000-some.

I mention that because every dollar of tax relief that this bill provides is going to have to be borrowed. We are going to have to pay interest on it. It is going to encumber our decisions in the future, whether to protect our Nation in national defense, homeland security, or to adequately fund our schools. I think it is immoral for us to create debt today in order to give a tax cut and then ask future generations to pay for those tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I said that this was an extension of a bill that we already passed. I think an argument could be made, but this is to expand that credit, to give an additional tax cut; and it is being done in a way that it is not paid for. I just think that is wrong.

I would hope that we would be able to work together on tax policies because I think there is some agreement on both sides of the aisle, but not the way that this legislation is being presented. I urge my colleagues to support the substitute and to reject the final version if the substitute is not approved.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and appreciate much of the work we have done together on the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

I would say, just a couple of weeks ago the other side of the aisle set their own definition of middle class when they offered an amendment on the floor to expand AMT to include ''more middle class families'' and exempt

them from the AMT, which is exactly the same levels we have tried to incorporate in this bill. We have changed this bill to include those families. We are working together to try to strengthen families in America and try to help families with the incredible costs and burdens of raising children today. So I think we can all agree it is those families that need help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I just wanted to touch base on this amendment and speak against the substitute.

The reason I want to do that is because the substitute actually increases taxes on small businesses in order to get to their tax credit. But more importantly, the tax credit is not a permanent fix. What we believe the young families need today is a permanent child tax credit so they can count on this for many years to come.

I am a father of four. I spend a lot of my time in the carpool line. In fact, I just left the House immediately after the last vote to drive my son to a Little League game. And after this last vote, I am going to drive back to the Little League game, and that is not untypical of working parents today. Parents are juggling money trying to raise these children. And often you think it is time for mom and dad to get a little relaxation. Well, they cannot do that because they have to put the money into new tires or a new dryer, children's braces, whatever.

This makes it helpful and affordable for families, who are often in the sandwich generation somewhere between having dependent children and dependent parents. I believe that the Camp bill, the Thomas bill, the Ways and Means Committee mark in its present form is a good bill.

I think that the Democrats have raised a lot of good points, and I share a lot of their concerns about our growing debt. I think it is time we start bringing that up, and I am glad that they are doing it. But I also feel when you reduce taxes, you put it back in the pocket of those who earn it, and they are going to go out and buy more hamburgers or clothes, more CDs. And when they do, small businesses are going to react. They are going to expand their inventory and hire more people, and it is going to be an extremely important multiplier to the economic engine of our society. Or as ADAM SMITH said, It is the invisible hand at work. We want to cut the budget, but we should not start with taking more money out of the taxpayers' pocket. We should start by overseeing some of these Federal Government programs and eliminating some of them.

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

I want to say respectfully to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), what the majority's bill does, adding a new tax cut, gives a tax cut to Members in the gentleman's position, not to families who are struggling to find money to buy books or buy hamburgers; and to dig a deeper hole for that reason is a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I too was struck by the words of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) because I think he has the rhetoric right, but I am concerned about the target for his concern. The Republican bill takes resources and extends them to families who make up to $309,000 a year for a family of three. I have people like that in my neighborhood who would like compassion, who would like some help, who are soccer moms and dads. But frankly, I am more concerned about those parents that do not have the resources to be soccer moms and dads, that parent who has three kids and works at minimum wage and who is left off altogether.

Somehow the concern that we have to raise the level to over $300,000 and ignore the people who are most in need, I find disingenuous and I find it sad.

This is not any confusion about whether or not the Democrats want to provide assistance for the middle class. The millionaire's tax that my Republican colleagues refused to fix on a permanent basis so they can use over a half trillion dollars to mask the costs of further tax cuts for people who need it the least is something that we tried to do something about so they would not be subjected to the millionaire's tax.

But today, we are talking about the child care credit. The Democrat substitute is seeking to focus it where it is needed most, not the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), not my friends in my neighborhood who make over $300,000 a year.

Most important, it is an opportunity for us to step back and think about who our priorities ought to be directed at. He talks about attacks on entrepreneurs because we would have a small surcharge on people who make over a millionaire dollars a year. Yes, it includes some entrepreneurs, it includes some power forwards, it includes some actuaries, but these people have been treated most generously. They have received massive reductions, increased disposable spending. To provide a modest adjustment to help the families most in need is something I can go back to my middle class, my upper middle class, my rich constituents, and I can defend.

Indeed, I do not have to. I have them asking me to do this for poor families. I have CEOs sitting next to me in airplanes saying why are you giving me these tax cuts when there are people who are more in need. I would hope our Republican colleagues would get in touch with those who need help the most.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), the sponsor of the base bill, H.R. 4359.

□ 1815

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, while we are speaking of those children who need help the most, I would like to talk about those children without parents, those foster kids that are impacted by the bill. The substitute, as proposed, will be a tax increase on kids who depend upon the kindness of strangers. The amendment, as written, will be a tax increase on those children. It will punish children who do not have parents.

I suggest to my colleagues that we reject this amendment, that we speak for those kids who need help the most, those without parents, and reject this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to just take a moment and say thank you to the staff for their hard work on the bill as originally written. I appreciate their efforts and time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I have no idea what the gentleman was referring to. No idea.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last night the Republican majority passed a $2.3 trillion budget that left a $500 billion deficit, showing it is impossible to finance three wars with three tax cuts.

They never miss an opportunity to stick it to working families and add to the deficit, in this case $228 billion. They never miss an opportunity.

When Ronald Reagan created the earned income tax credit and Bill Clinton doubled the size of it in 1993, we actually cut taxes and reduced the deficit. In 1997, we balanced the budget, invested millions of dollars in health care for uninsured children and created the $500 per child tax credit. We did it while balancing the budget.

They have taken the whole notion of fiscal responsibility, thrown it out, added $228 billion to the deficit, raiding Social Security at that time, just so they can have a tax cut and stick it right to working families who, more than just tires and braces, who do not have health care in some cases.

So you can actually have a tax cut, balance the budget, provide health care, open the doors to college education, but you have to govern and, as President Kennedy once said, to govern is to choose. Those are things that they refuse to do. They do not try to make those choices.

We have two proposals here to expand the child credit, but we have two different visions of America, two different sets of values. We are willing to make the choices that put working families, the interest of their health care, their children, their family, their college education, their savings at the front and center without raiding, without destroying, Social Security. In the last three times that they have

brought up tax cuts, they have never missed an opportunity to raid Social Security and add deficit.

In the last 3 years they have added $3 trillion to the deficit, 3 million Americans have been unemployed and they have had three tax cuts. I do not know what it is about the number three that they love so much. I have no idea.

What they have done here is they have decided to stick it to working families. We need to go back, to put our fiscal house in order, not raiding our children's future, provide a tax cut for working families and reduce the deficit. Not to say, ''I empathize with my colleagues on the other side about the importance of the deficit'' but to do something, after passing a budget with a $500 billion hole, do something that we can provide a tax cut finally to working families so they can get the resources and know it is there without raiding Social Security from their grandparents while you are doing it.

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

I certainly appreciate the gentleman's view of history. I would just point out that he forgot to mention that the previous administration signed the largest tax increase in history, which actually started to begin the economic decline that occurred at the end of the last administration.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that what we are trying to do here in terms of helping middle-class families is exactly the same definition that my friends on the other side used 2 weeks ago in their attempts to change the AMT to make that more beneficial.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, twenty-two million new jobs, the beginning of an economic recession. Lifting 4.3 million families out of poverty, the beginning of an economic recession. Reduction of uninsured in this country from 44 million to 38 million, the beginning of our economic recession?

There is a rampant case of an inversion in the world. To the people that had those jobs, more people going to college, more people not in poverty, more people with health care, and the gentleman says that is the beginning of the recession? I could have sworn in the 1990s when I was around, all the Republicans talked about was that it had nothing to do with Bill Clinton; it had everything to do with Ronald Reagan's boom from the 1980s. Maybe the gentleman needs a rendezvous with history here and a rendezvous with his record.

He is right, we raised taxes on the wealthiest and we cut them on working families, and we reduced the deficit and had a balanced budget. I would recommend that the gentleman take a rendezvous with that record of what a balanced budget would look like, since his colleagues have done a great job of adding $3 trillion to the Nation's debt.

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

Let me just say that my friend's view of this whole economy and budget process is very different, because while his party was in control, the budget was not balanced for two generations. It took our party to gain the majority to actually bring some fiscal sanity to the process.

I would just say that what we are debating here today, though, is whether we are going to extend the child tax credit permanently and whether we are going to do that in a way to help more low-income families, more middle-class families and more military families. The base bill does that.

The substitute regrettably raises taxes on small businesses and entrepreneurs. That is exactly the wrong thing to do as we begin to see job creation come again; 1.2 million jobs since October of last year have been created as a result of the tax relief that we have passed.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side have a distorted concept of history inasmuch as we lived under a balanced budget for the years that President Clinton was in office and we struggled together in a unified way to bump up the economy.

Right now, in the fourth largest city in the Nation, in Houston, Texas, not only are there cuts to the pension of working men and women, the city budget is not only cutting their pensions, laying off people in the library, in the health department, pulling out strings so that we can find a way to finance the needs of the citizens of Houston. But that is the story of major cities around the country. Sadly, it is taking place in Houston, and I wish it was not.

But this particular legislation that my good friends have on the other side is leaving 3 million people at the bottom without a child tax credit and giving us a $228 billion bill that we cannot pay. I would rather my friends look closely at their proposal and wonder why those who are making $300,000 a year, who have, as my colleagues have already indicated, received generous cuts, now putting those others at the bottom of the barrel.

In a letter by Margaret written to the Houston Chronicle in July 2003 she begged as a student making $10,000, with an 8-year-old son, why she could not get a child tax credit, why we are making it permanent for those who make $300,000 a year, yet Margaret who is trying to make ends meet, get an education and take care of that 8-year-old child cannot, in fact, get that kind of coverage.

This substitute allows us to provide for those working families along with those who have already made it. We do not discriminate against them. We want to have tax cuts for the middle class and working families. But what we do not want to have is a splurge that we cannot afford. Waging war in Iraq, waging war in Afghanistan, young military personnel cannot even afford to put food on their table; and they are giving us a $228 billion deficit.

I argue vigorously for the substitute, not for us and not for partisanship, but for working families. Three million of them are not yet going to be able to see a tax cut today. We need the Rangel-Levin substitute in order to make it work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4359, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act, and I call on this body to adopt the more fiscally responsible Rangel Substitute. The Rangel Substitute gives real tax relief to middle-class Americans while not raising the deficit.

Conversely, the original legislation of the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code in the following ways:

To repeal the scheduled reductions in the amount of the child tax credit for taxable years beginning in 2005 through 2009 (from $1,000 to $700 in 2005 through 2008 and $800 in 2009);

To make the $1,000 credit amount permanent;

To increase the income threshold amount for calculating reductions in the credit amount to $125,000 ($250,000 for married taxpayers filing a joint return).

To eliminate the reduction in the percentage of earned income for calculating the refundable portion of the credit (15 to 10 percent) for taxable years beginning before 2005;

To include in earned income for purposes of calculating the refundable portion of the credit otherwise tax excludable combat zone compensation of members of the armed forces; and

To exempt from the general termination date in the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (December 31, 2010) provisions of that Act disregarding as income any refunds from the child tax credit for purposes of determining eligibility for federally funded assistance programs.

Mr. Speaker, the original legislation, as drafted will allocate $70 billion in permanent tax cuts to 2 million taxpayers with children who are in the top 10 percent of the income hierarchy but leaves working families ''in the lurch.'' Furthermore, the bill threatens the welfare of middle-class families because the drafters have failed to include provisions to pay for these tax cuts—increasing record deficits that threaten economic growth, raise interest rates, and cost jobs.

Mr. Speaker, instead, I support the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by my esteemed colleague from New York and that has been made in order by the Committee on Rules. In sharp contrast to the instant bill, Mr. RANGEL's proposal will ensure that the Republican tax cuts are paid for through 2010, will increase the child tax credit for more than 31 million people to help middle-income families with children (over 75 percent)

currently receiving the credit, and provide the child tax credit to an additional 2.5 million working families, instead of directing this tremendous relief to a groups who have already benefited tremendously under the Bush tax cuts.

Middle-class families would be better off if tax cuts were paid for. Given the loss of 2.2 million private-sector jobs over the past three years, Democrats believe tax cuts should not add to the budget deficits, as ballooning deficits threaten economic growth, raise interest rates and cost jobs. Instead of taking the responsible course of action and paying for these tax cuts, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle choose instead to increase our debt and deficit levels. Economists agree that federal budget deficits threaten to crowd out private investment and raise interest rates on mortgages, consumer credit and business borrowing, which will slow economic growth and job creation. Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan warned that soaring budget deficits represent a "significant obstacle to long-term stability" in the economy." (Washington Post, 5/7/04) "The [child tax credit] bill . . . is the most egregious part of a House tax-cutting spree that altogether would add more than $500 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years." (editorial, Washington Post, 5/19/04) Republicans have already taken us from a $5.6 trillion 10-year surplus to a nearly $3 trillion deficit, and now are proposing to add another $228 billion in this bill.

This bill is increasing the deficit to provide tax breaks for higher-income taxpayers, while doing nothing for working families. Instead of providing more tax cuts to middle-income families or helping working families struggling to get into the middle class or making minimum wage, Republicans spend nearly $70 billion (or 30 percent) of the tax cuts on extending the child tax to taxpayers making up to nearly $300,000. According to the Tax Policy Center, 40 percent of the benefits of the Republican bill go to the top 10 percent of taxpayers making over $100,000. For example, a family with a parent working full-time at the minimum wage ($10,300) would get no benefit at all from the bill, while two-child families earning up to $250,000 would get an extra $20,000 in tax breaks over the next 10 years. "This is unnecessary, misguided and irresponsible. Families at that income level have already enjoyed significant benefits from the recent tax cuts; they don't need an extra subsidy to help support their children." (editorial, Washington Post, 5/19/04).

Democrats pay for these tax cuts and require a balanced budget to make the tax cuts permanent. Democrats know we can provide real tax relief to millions of families without endangering our economy or threatening job creation. The Democratic plan essentially pays for these tax cuts through 2010, through a small surtax on the most affluent 0.2 percent of households in America—for couples the surtax only applies to those with annual incomes over $1 million. Democrats are committed to tax cuts that are fiscally responsible. That is why the Democratic plan makes these tax cuts permanent once Congress enacts legislation to balance the budget by 2014, as Republicans have already promised to do, without tapping into the Social Security or Medicare surplus.

The Democratic plan provides more tax relief for middle-income families and working families. The Democratic plan will provide more tax relief to more than 31 million (over 75 percent) of middle-income families—those making less than $110,000. It does so by indexing the $1,000 child tax credit for inflation bringing it to $1,100 in 2009. It also provides the child tax credit to an additional 2.5 million working families with children by lowering the income at which families are eligible from $10,750 to $10,000. Democrats will fight to make sure that tax cuts are targeted to the nearly 85 percent of middle-income and working families feeling the squeeze in the Bush economy.

Democrats have long favored more tax relief for middle-income families. Last year, Democrats worked to provide long-lasting tax cuts for middle-income families, including rescinding the marriage penalty—providing the child tax credit for more people and for a longer period of time. Unfortunately, Republicans are consistently willing to shortchange middle-class families in order to provide tax cuts for the wealthy. Last year, Republicans made the acceleration of the marriage penalty relief, child tax credit, and the 10 percent bracket temporary in order to protect their tax cuts for corporate dividends. This "problem" is one they themselves created.

Extending tax cuts is not an economic plan. Republicans have launched a phony P.R. offensive called "Hire our Workers," but they have yet to explain how they lost 2.2 million private sector jobs, how they increased the deficit to $3 trillion, or how their failed economic policies are going to lead to the hiring of even one additional worker. Democrats have a real plan to create jobs, by passing bipartisan tax relief for manufacturers that keep jobs here in the U.S., passing a robust highway bill, fully funding the Small Business Administration, passing middle class tax cuts that are fully paid for, and putting the federal government back on a "pay as you go" basis. I urge the entire body to reject H.R. 4359 and adopt the Rangel Substitute which is the only responsible fiscal legislation before this body that actually benefits middle-class Americans.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 8, 2003]

A POOR MOTHER: MY CHILD'S WORTH TAX CREDIT, TOO

(By Margaret Gaffin)

I'm among the millions of men and women being shafted by the Bush administration.

Under the Bush administration's new tax law, families whose taxable income is more than $26,625 will see an increase in the Child Tax Credit of $400 for a total of $1,000. They will get a check in the mail for the difference this summer.

For working families whose taxable income is between $10,500 and $26,625, it's still being debated as to when and if they will receive the credit after they were left out of the bill the first time.

At the same time, the entire tax bill is expected to return an average of $90,000 a year to people making more than a million dollars a year. Not to mention the fact that most of the members of Congress stand to receive dividends. But families earning less than $10,500 like mine will remain ineligible for any part of the child tax credit.

My situation is like millions of women around the country. While we work, go to school and care for our children, we often don't get paid well. My dream is to give back to my community by working in social services like being a probation officer. I have lived a tough life and know how trying it is where there is no one to lend a helping hand in difficult circumstances.

Being in human services will allow me to be that helping hand for other families and the children facing hard times. I'm going to school full time to complete my associate's degree. This means I bring home $5,600 a year, since I can work only part time. Student loans help pay some expenses, but it still is not enough.

It hurts when my 8-year-old daughter wants to go to the movies or even have a meal at McDonald's and I have to say, "No, Mommy can't afford it." If I had gotten a tax cut, I would spend it on bills that face me. Like millions of other working people, I would have put the money right back into the economy.

(Unlike many millionaires, who will most likely put their $90,000 refund in the bank or spend it on stocks or campaign contributions to keep those tax cuts coming.)

The deficit caused by this tax cut is already being felt in states around the country. In Ohio, we had to cut back Head Start programs and medical expenses, leaving millions of children without early education and medical insurance.

It seems shortsighted. The expenses our country will have to pay by not healing ill children and providing a quality education at an early age will be counted not only in dollars, but also in the pain of impoverished human lives.

Twelve million kids, including 1 million military children, are being penalized because their parents are teachers, social workers or in the armed forces. When the President and Congress ignore us, we are being told that our children aren't as valuable as those of persons making more than we do. We are told that our children are not worth a tax credit, even though we work and pay taxes like everyone else. When all the dust settles, I hope our congressional leaders will stop placing higher value on a child from a rich family over my daughter because I am poor.

I'd like to believe that another world is possible, a world where we have equal opportunity, and one child is not favored over another because of skin color or wealth.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that I urge Members to reject the substitute because it does not make the child tax credit permanent, it ends in 2010, and we need to make that tax relief permanent.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I could not help noticing today that the President had to come up here and stiffen the spine of his troops. I understand that they are getting a little weak-kneed but this is the rubber-stamp Congress, and we know that when the President comes up here and asks for something, no matter how big the deficit is or how many poor people or ordinary working folks you exclude, you will do exactly what he wants.

The people should understand, this is a priority of the President of the United States. He is the one that wants to cut the money or give more money to people on the top. His whole idea is, if I can give enough to the people on the top, I will get reelected.

I noticed some of the Members were a little worried there when we had that discussion about having an investigation of what is going on with the prisoners and how high up the ladder that

goes. There were a lot of weak knees over there. They are going home and they have got to take home this tax credit, by God. I can hear them saying it down in HC–5 today: ''Gentlemen, you have to vote for this because you'll have nothing else to say.'' You have got to say something to cover up what is going on in Iraq.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the full Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I assume there is some relevancy to this particular debate on this particular measure offered by the gentleman from Washington.

But I think we really ought to put this entire debate in perspective. In 1993, with a Democrat President and a Democratically controlled Congress, the largest tax increase in the history of the United States was put in place. There was an opportunity at that time to make adjustments on the Alternative Minimum Tax which would not place us in the position that we are in today. That measure passed this House with all Democratic votes and no Republican votes. That was in the first full year of President Clinton's presidency.

The next year was an off-year election for the House of Representatives and one-third of the United States Senate. The American people, for the first time in 40 years, decided that empty promises and failure to deliver and continuing to assume that by requiring Americans to send a dollar to Washington with bureaucratic waste, fraud and abuse subtracted and the 86 cents, the 82 cents, the 76 cents that was sent back to them on programs that they promised to help them was a failed policy. That produced the first Congress of a Republican majority in 40 years.

Ten years later, Republicans are still in the majority. I do not see any better example of the fundamental choices in which the American people chose our way of dealing with issues versus theirs.

Somehow requiring people to pay taxes when they have children at home, for which the amount we are debating does not even offset inflation over the last decade, of increasing the child deduction, somehow allowing them to keep $1,000 per child so that perhaps a school choice would be different, perhaps an educational or enlightenment trip would be different, so that that child in terms of the $20,000 that is going to be available to someone, have you checked college tuition nowadays? The concept of putting money away for future education can be assisted by this $1,000.

□ 1830

And the real problem to my friends on the other side is to see a dollar of tax revenue lost because they did not get it, they did not get their fingers on it, and they did not create a program in the hopes that someone would vote for them because they were going to give them the money.

What I see is an opportunity for a family to allow that child to be enriched over their lifetime, that, in, fact they do go to college. Anybody knows, and graphs show today, a college education is worth about $4 million over the earning life of that individual. And do you know what you do when you make that much money? You surely know listening to their arguments, because if people make a little bit of money, they pay a lot of taxes.

One of the things Republicans have done in this Tax Code is to drop more people off the tax rolls than they have ever done in the history of the time that they have controlled the House of Representatives.

Now, there is a problem when people do not pay income taxes, because they do not get the benefits of the structure of the income tax, for example, the child tax credit. So they then come to the well and say people who do not pay income taxes should get the benefits, notwithstanding the fact they do not pay income taxes, of the people who pay income taxes. That is an unfair system.

And all we are saying is let us give the American family a little security and assurance. What we do in our proposal is make it $1,000 and make it permanent. What they do is dangle out the opportunity that there may be $1,000. If someone in the executive branch certifies that what this constitutionally independent body can do is okay to do, they turn over fundamental legislative decisions to the executive branch. Does the executive branch certify that we can do it? Yes or no?

That is how desperate these people are, to come up with an angle which allows them to say this is what we are going to offer, with the ability, in fact, to jerk it away and never allow the American family to get the $1,000 child tax credit.

So the choice is pretty simple. Certainty, appropriateness, and the investment where we think that investment does the most good, to the family for them to decide. That is the proposal before us.

The substitute says let us promise something that is not guaranteed, that someone in an entirely different constitutional structure will tell you whether or not you can do it. I think that is why finally in 1994 the American people said we have had enough, we want to go a different way.

And to my friend from Texas talking about a balanced budget under the Clinton administration, to make sure history is accurate, 6 of those 8 years Republicans were in the majority in the House and the Senate. That is how we came out of the deficit. Everybody knows the world's circumstances that we were in. We will get out of the deficit again how? By not hoping that keeping taxpayers poor and government rich will solve the problem, but by making sure that we invest in the future in the American way, let those people spend their own money in ways they think bring the best return. And guess what, jobs are created, productivity is up, more taxes come in, i.e., we have revenue coming in.

The real question of whether or not we are able to grow out of this deficit is whether or not we control spending. Not giving people their own money back to spend, that is not the problem. It is new programs, larger programs, spending, that is the greatest concern.

A pretty fundamental battle here today. Invest in individuals that made America great, provide more fodder for government spending so that these folks can say I gave them something. We want the mother and father to tell the child they gave them something, not the government.

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

The issue is not extension of the child credit. We favor it. Nor taking into account the needs of military families. We are very much for it.

There is a difference and a big difference. Why should we create a new tax program here? Why? Why for families making $300,000, $250,000? Are they the families in need? And is it right to do so when we add $70 billion to the deficit? The answer, I say to my chairman, pay for it. Pay for it.

You say it is not permanent and yet you say you are going to grow out of the deficit. Okay. If you are right, our proposal is permanent. If you are wrong, as you have been before, in some years we will take another look. Do not raise, I hope again in your remarks, even though when you have a message, you keep after it even if it is wrong, the AMT illustration. It is simply not correct. We do not use the term ''middle class'' in our AMT proposal. What we say is the AMT should be used for the same purpose as it was intended, for very wealthy families, and we are consistent because we say do not add a new child credit, a new tax break for very wealthy families when you are digging another $70 billion in the hole.

That is not fiscally responsible, as I said before. It is fiscal insanity. Do not raise children when your kids and my grandkids, if not my children, would pay for your irresponsibility, adding $70 billion to the already huge pile of debt. It is red enough. Do not add to it.

I urge that we vote for this responsible substitute and that we vote ''no'' against a very irresponsible, unneeded, additional tax credit that is in their proposal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the Rangel substitute for three reasons: the Rangel substitute does not make the $1,000 tax credit permanent. The Rangel substitute will cut the $1,000 child tax credit in 2011 in half,

according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. The result: millions of low-income families and military families will face a hefty tax increase. In addition, more than 1 million more taxpayers would fall victim to the Alternative Minimum Tax.

The second reason to reject the Rangel substitute is that it does not include tax relief for middle-class families in the way of the child tax credit. In the Democrat substitute to the AMT bill, it was the Democrats who defined middle-class families as single parents earning $125,000 a year and married couples earning $250,000 a year. This substitute would deny the full credit to families in those ranges. As a result, this substitute does not give the full tax credit to families defined by my friends on the other side as middle class.

Thirdly, the Rangel substitute raises taxes on small businesses and entrepreneurs. The Democrat alternative creates a new tax that will hit approximately 200,000 individual tax returns. Seventy-five percent of those have business income, the same small business community that we have been working so hard to bring back. The House has rejected similar tax increases twice in the last 3 weeks.

I urge my colleagues to believe in parents, believe in families, believe in children, reject the Rangel substitute, and vote for H.R. 4359.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 644, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. 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 187, nays 226, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—187

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

NAYS—226

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

NOT VOTING—20

Ballance
Burr
DeMint
Deutsch
Gallegly
Johnson, Sam
LaTourette
Leach
Lipinski
Lofgren
Marshall
McInnis
McIntyre
Menendez
Miller, Gary
Murtha
Norwood
Owens
Rush
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1903

Mr. PLATTS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 271, noes 139, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—271

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Costello

Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—139

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Majette
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—23

Ballance
Blunt
Burr
DeMint
Deutsch
Ferguson
Gallegly
Gutierrez
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Lipinski
Lofgren
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
McIntyre
Menendez
Miller, Gary
Murtha
Norwood
Owens
Rush
Tauzin
Turner (TX)

□ 1920

Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. SCHIFF changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 209, I was unavoidably detained on H.R. 4359, Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, because of an emergency in my district, I missed rollcall vote No. 208 and No. 209. If present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 208 and "nay" on rollcall vote No. 209.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. 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 H.R. 4359, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 24, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Monday, May 24, 2004, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 432, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

## DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, June 2, 2004.

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

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF HON. WAYNE T. GILCHREST OR HON. MAC THORNBERRY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JUNE 1, 2004

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*May 20, 2004.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable WAYNE T. GILCHREST or, if not available to perform this duty, the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 1, 2004.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

## CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROTECTING THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR IRAQ AND CERTAIN OTHER PROPERTY IN WHICH IRAQ HAS AN INTEREST—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108–187)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, as expanded in scope by Executive Order 13315 of August 28, 2003, protecting the Development Fund for Iraq and certain other property in which Iraq has an interest, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2004, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq constituted by the threat of attachment or other judicial process against the Development Fund for Iraq, Iraqi petroleum and petroleum products, and interests therein, and proceeds, obligations, or any financial instruments of any nature whatsoever arising from or related to the sale or marketing thereof, pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency protecting the Development Fund for Iraq, and certain other property in which Iraq has an interest, and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 2004*.

## U.S. ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Consistent with the provisions of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, as amended (15 U.S.C. 408(a)), I transmit herewith the eighth biennial revision (2004–2008) to the United States Arctic Research Plan, as prepared for the Congress and the Administration by the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 2004*.

## A FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

## MOUNT NOTRE DAME WINS STATE TITLES IN GOLF AND BASKETBALL

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of two outstanding groups of young women from my District. Both happen to be from Mount Notre Dame High School.

This past fall the Mount Notre Dame golf team registered its second consecutive Ohio State championship with an impressive 23-stroke victory over Cincinnati rival Ursuline Academy. The Cougars dominated, finishing 16 strokes better than their previous year's State title performance.

Not to be outdone by their classmates, Mount Notre Dame's basketball team was crowned Ohio State champions with a convincing 59 to 44 win over Chaminade-Julienne. The victory topped off a perfect 28 and 0 season and propelled the team to a number two national ranking in the prestigious USA Today poll.

It gives me great pleasure to recognize the continued success of Mount Notre Dame High School, its coaches and administrators, and these young women who serve as ideal role models for future generations of high school student athletes.

Congratulations, Mount Notre Dame.

## THANKING FEDERAL EXPRESS AND RICK SICILIANO, LISA DANIEL, DEANDRE SAM, THOMAS DALE AND A-ROCKET

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, the children of Houston collected books, story books, pens, paper and other supplies for the children of Afghanistan. We know that their lives have been extremely difficult, but yet the new government is seeking to provide them with an education.

I rise today to thank Rick Siciliano of Federal Express and Lisa Daniel of Federal Express, constituents A-Rocket, the company, A-Rocket, with DeAndre Sam, the owner, and Thomas Dale, for making the dreams of Afghanistan children a reality as they will help get those books from the children of Houston over to Afghanistan.

This has been an effort that has been done in love and commitment, working across not only the aisle but across the land and across the sea. The children of Afghanistan have stood up to say we want to learn, boys and girls, and I just want to give my greatest appreciation for those who will be willing to support this effort in a humanitarian way and to help the children of Houston make their dreams come true to be friends of the children of Afghanistan.

Again, to Rick Siciliano, Lisa Daniel, DeAndre Sam and Thomas Dale, a big thank you on behalf of the children of Afghanistan.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF SHERIDAN GARRISON

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Sheridan Garrison, whose untimely death was announced today.

In the early 1980s, Sheridan founded Arkansas Freightways, which became American Freightways, a company that serviced points in 40 States and employed 16,000 people across the country, including 1,000 in his hometown of Harrison, Arkansas. In 2000, FedEx purchased American Freightways, making Sheridan the director.

Through the years, Sheridan always kept his focus on being a good community partner. When Arkansas Business profiled Sheridan in 1988, he described how he would like to be remembered. He said, ''I want to be remembered for being a decent person, for doing what I said I would do, as someone who created an environment where people would choose to work and succeed. And for being a decent father, husband and brother, by people who love me in spite of my faults.''

Mr. Speaker, Sheridan will be remembered for all of these traits and more. I ask my colleagues to keep his family in their thoughts and in their prayers.

## THE FINANCIAL PENALTY RESULTING FROM SAME-SEX MARRIAGES

(Mr. BACHUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, an enormous unrevealed financial penalty will result from same-sex marriage recognition, but there has been little discussion. Why is the media looking the other way? Do seniors not have the right to know it will affect their Social Security benefits? Do taxpayers not have the right to know that it will affect their taxes, both State and Federal? Does the public not have the right to know that it means less money for roads, schools, medical research, veterans benefits? In fact, it was the Social Security issue that side-lined a similar proposal in the Canadian Parliament.

What is the cost? I include in the RECORD a GAO report outlining 1,138 Federal programs impacted if same-sex marriages are recognized in this country, an enormous price tag, hundreds of billions of dollars.

The American people have the right to know. We need to discuss this issue. We are going to give benefits to same-sex couples we do not give to Americans caring for disabled and elderly relatives. We are going to give it to same-sex couples who have no children and give them the same benefits we give married couple with several children.

We need to discuss this issue. It is going to cost billions of dollars.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
*Washington, DC, January 23, 2004.*

Subject: Defense of Marriage Act: Update to Prior Report

Hon. BILL FRIST,
*Majority Leader,*
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR FRIST: The Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) provides definitions of ''marriage'' and ''spouse'' that are to be used in construing the meaning of a federal law and, thus, affect the interpretation of a wide variety of federal laws in which marital status is a factor. In 1997, we issued a report

identifying 1,049 federal statutory provisions classified to the United States Code in which benefits, rights, and privileges are contingent on marital status or in which marital status is a factor. In preparing the 1997 report, we limited our search to laws enacted prior to September 21, 1996, the date DOMA was signed into law. Recently, you asked us to update our 1997 compilation.

We have identified 120 statutory provisions involving marital status that were enacted between September 21, 1996, and December 31, 2003. During the same period, 31 statutory provisions involving marital status were repealed or amended in such a way as to eliminate marital status as a factor. Consequently, as of December 31, 2003, our research identified a total of 1,138 federal statutory provisions classified to the United States Code in which marital status is a factor in determining or receiving benefits, rights, and privileges.

To prepare the updated list, we used the same research methods and legal databases that we employed in 1997. Accordingly, the same caveats concerning the completeness of our collection of laws apply to this updated compilation, as explained more fully in our prior report. For example, because of the inherent limitations of any global electronic search and the many ways in which the laws of the United States Code may deal with marital status, we cannot guarantee that we have captured every individual law in the United States Code in which marital status figures. However, we believe that the probability is high that the updated list identified federal programs in the United States Code in which marital status is a factor.

We have organized our research using the same 13 subject categories as the 1997 report. As agreed with your staff, in addition to providing you with a primary table of new statutory provisions involving marital status, we have prepared a second table identifying those provisions in our prior report that subsequently have been repealed or amended in a manner that eliminates marital status as a factor. Finally, in a third table, we have listed those provisions identified in our 1997 report that have since been relocated to a different section of the United States Code. We have also attached a brief summary of the 13 research categories; a full description of each category is set forth in the 1997 report.

We plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days after the date of this letter. At that time, we will send copies of this letter to interested congressional committees. The letter will also be available on GAO's home page at http://www.gao.gov.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 512–8208 or by E-mail at shahd@gao.gov. Behn Miller Kelly and Richard Burkard made key contributions to this project.

Sincerely yours,

DAYNA K. SHAH,
*Associate General Counsel.*

# APPENDIX 1

**Table of Statutory Provisions Involving Marital Status Added to the United States Code Between September 21, 1996, and December 31, 2003, by Category**

## CATEGORY 1—SOCIAL SECURITY AND RELATED PROGRAMS, HOUSING, AND FOOD STAMPS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 42 – The Public Health and Welfare** | |
| **Chapter 6A—Public Health Service** | |
| ***Subchapter II*** | |
| ***Part D—Primary Health Care*** | |
| **Subpart I—Health Centers** | |
| § 254d | National Health Service Corps |
| ***Subchapter IV—Grants to States for Aid and Services to Needy Families with Children and for Child-Welfare Services*** | |
| ***Part B—Child and Family Services*** | |
| **Subpart 2—Promoting Safe and Stable Families** | |
| § 629a | Definitions |
| ***Subchapter XI—General Provisions, Peer Review, and Administrative Simplification*** | |
| ***Part A—General Provisions*** | |
| § 1320a-7 | Exclusion of certain individuals and entities from participation in Medicare and state health care programs |
| § 1320b-17 | Recovery of SSI overpayments from other benefits |
| ***Part C—Medicare + Choice Program*** | |
| § 1395w-22 | Benefits and beneficiary protections |
| § 1395w-23 | Payments to Medicare + Choice organizations |
| § 1395w-27 | Contracts with Medicare + Choice organizations |
| ***Part D—Miscellaneous Provisions*** | |
| § 1395x | Definitions |
| § 1395ff | Determinations; appeals |
| **Chapter 35—Programs for Older Americans** | |
| ***Subchapter III—Grants for States and Community Programs on Aging*** | |
| ***Part C—Nutrition Services*** | |
| ***Subpart III—General Provisions*** | |
| § 3030g-21 | General provisions—nutrition |
| § 3030s | Definitions |
| **Chapter 46—Justice System Improvement** | |
| ***Subchapter XII—F—Public Safety Officers' Death Benefits*** | |
| ***Part A—Death Benefits*** | |
| § 3796d | Purposes |
| § 3796d-1 | Basic eligibility |
| ***Subchapter XII—H—Grants to Combat Violent Crimes against Women*** | |
| § 3796gg-1 | State grants |
| **Chapter 84—Department of Energy** | |
| ***Part A—Establishment of Compensation Program and Compensation Fund*** | |
| ***Subchapter XVI—Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program*** | |
| § 7384s | Compensation and benefits to be provided |
| § 7384u | Separate treatment of certain uranium employees |
| ***Part C—Treatment, Coordination, and Forfeiture of Compensation and Benefits*** | |
| § 7385c | Exclusivity of remedy against the United States and against contractors and subcontractors |
| **Chapter 110—Family Violence Prevention and Services** | |
| § 10410 | Grants for state domestic violence coalitions |
| § 10421 | Definitions |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chapter 129—National and Community Service**<br>*Subchapter I—National and Community Service State Grant Program*<br>*Division F—Administrative Provisions* | |
| § 12639 | Evaluation |
| **Chapter 130—National Affordable Housing**<br>*Subchapter I—General Provisions and Policies* | |
| § 12704 | Definitions |
| §12713 | Eligibility under first-time home-buyer programs |
| **Chapter 136—Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement**<br>*Subchapter III—Violence against Women*<br>*Part C—Civil Rights for Women* | |
| § 13981 | Civil rights |
| § 13992 | Training provided by grants |
| **Chapter 143—Intercountry Adoptions**<br>*Subchapter V—General Provisions* | |
| § 14952 | Special rules for certain cases |

CATEGORY 2—VETERANS' BENEFITS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 38—Veterans' Benefits** | |
| **Part II—General Benefits**<br>**Chapter 17—Hospital, Nursing Home, Domiciliary, and Medical Care**<br>*Subchapter II—Hospital, Nursing Home, Or Domiciliary Care and Medical Treatment* | |
| § 1710B | Extended care services |
| *Subchapter VIII—Health Care of Persons other than Veterans* | |
| § 1781 | Medical care for survivors and dependents of certain veterans |
| **Chapter 18—Benefits for Children of Vietnam Veterans**<br>*Subchapter III—General Provisions* | |
| § 1821 | Definitions |
| **Chapter 19—Insurance**<br>*Subchapter III—Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance* | |
| § 1967 | Person insured; amount |
| § 1969 | Deductions; payment; investment; expenses |
| **Chapter 23—Burial Benefits** | |
| § 2306 | Headstones, markers, and burial receptacles |
| **Part III—Readjustment and Related Benefits**<br>**Chapter 30—All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program**<br>*Subchapter II—Basic Educational Assistance* | |
| § 3020 | Transfer of entitlement to basic educational assistance: members of the Armed Forces with critical military skills |
| **Chapter 42—Employment and Reemployment Rights of Members of the Uniformed Services** | |
| § 4215 | Priority of service for veterans in Department of Labor job training programs |
| **Part IV—General Administrative Provisions**<br>**Chapter 53—Special Provisions Relating to Benefits** | |
| § 5302 | Waiver of recovery of claims by the United States |
| § 5313B | Prohibition on providing certain benefits with respect to persons who are fugitive felons |
| **Part V—Boards, Administrations, and Services**<br>**Chapter 77—Veterans Benefits Administration**<br>*Subchapter II—Veterans Outreach Services Program* | |
| § 7721 | Purpose; definitions |

**CATEGORY 3—TAXATION**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 26—Internal Revenue Code** | |
| **Subtitle A—Income Taxes** | |
| **Chapter 1—Normal Taxes and Surtaxes** | |
| ***Subchapter A—Determination of Tax Liability*** | |
| ***Part IV—Credits Against Tax*** | |
| ***Subpart A—Nonrefundable Personal Credits*** | |
| § 24 | Child tax credit |
| §25A | Hope and lifetime learning credits |
| § 25B | Tax imposed on individuals |
| ***Subchapter B—Computation of Taxable Income*** | |
| ***Part III—Items Specifically Excluded from Gross Income*** | |
| § 101 | Certain death benefits |
| ***Part VII—Additional Itemized Deductions for Individuals*** | |
| § 138 | Medicare + Choice MSA |
| § 221 | Interest on education loans |
| ***Subchapter D—Deferred Compensation, Etc.*** | |
| ***Part I—Pension, Profit-Sharing, Stock Bonus Plans, Etc.*** | |
| ***Subpart A—General Rule*** | |
| § 408A | Roth IRAs |
| ***Subchapter F—Exempt Organizations*** | |
| ***Part VIII—Higher Education Savings Entities*** | |
| § 529 | Qualified tuition programs |
| § 530 | Coverdell education savings accounts |
| ***Subchapter K—Partners and Partnerships*** | |
| ***Part IV—Special Rules for Electing Large Partnerships*** | |
| § 774 | Other modifications |
| § 775 | Electing large partnership defined |
| ***Subchapter O—Gain or Loss on Disposition of Property*** | |
| ***Part II—Basis Rules of General Application*** | |
| § 1022 | Treatment of property acquired by decedent dying after December 31, 2009 |
| ***Subchapter W—District of Columbia Enterprise Zone*** | |
| § 1400C | First-time home-buyer credit for District of Columbia |
| **Subtitle B—Estate and Gift Taxes** | |
| **Chapter 11—Estate Tax** | |
| ***Subchapter A—Estates Of Citizens Or Residents*** | |
| ***Part IV—Taxable Estate*** | |
| § 2057 | Family-owned business interests |
| | ***Subchapter C—Miscellaneous*** |
| § 2210 | Termination |
| **Chapter 12—Gift Tax** | |
| ***Subchapter B—Transfers*** | |
| § 2511 | Transfers in general |
| **Chapter 13—Tax on Generation-Skipping Transfers** | |
| ***Subchapter D—GST Exemption*** | |
| § 2632 | Special rules for allocation of GST exemption |
| **Subtitle F—Procedure and Administration** | |
| **Chapter 61—Information and Returns** | |
| ***Subchapter A—Returns and Records*** | |
| ***Part II—Tax Returns or Statements*** | |
| ***Subpart B—Income Tax Returns*** | |
| § 6015 | Relief from joint and several liability on joint return |
| ***Part III—Information Returns*** | |
| ***Subpart B—Information Concerning Transactions with Other Persons*** | |
| § 6045 | Returns of brokers |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chapter 62—Time and Place for Paying Tax** *Subchapter A—Place and Due Date for Payment of Tax* | |
| § 6159 | Agreements for payment of tax liability in installments |
| **Chapter 63—Assessment** *Subchapter C—Tax Treatment of Partnership Items* | |
| § 6230 | Additional administrative provisions |
| **Chapter 66—Limitations** *Subchapter B—Limitations on Credit or Refund* | |
| § 6511 | Limitations on credit or refund |

**CATEGORY 4—FEDERAL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY SERVICE BENEFITS**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 5—Government Organization and Employees** | |
| **Part III—Employees** **Subpart A—General Provisions** **Chapter 23—Merit system principles** | |
| § 2301 | Merit system principles |
| § 2302 | Prohibited personnel practices |
| **Subpart B—Employment and Retention** **Chapter 33—Examination, Selection, and Placement** *Subchapter I—Examination, Certification and Appointment* | |
| § 3301 | Civil service; generally |
| **Subpart D—Pay and Allowances** **Chapter 57—Travel, Transportation, And Subsistence** *Subchapter II—Travel And Transportation Expenses; New Appointees, Student Trainees, And Transferred Employees* | |
| § 5737 | Relocation expenses of an employee who is performing an extended assignment |
| **Chapter 59—Allowances** *Subchapter III—Overseas Differentials And Allowances* | |
| § 5922 | General provisions |
| **Subpart G—Insurance and Annuities** **Chapter 90—Long-term Care Insurance** | |
| § 9001 | Definitions |
| § 9002 | Availability of insurance |
| § 9003 | Contracting authority |
| **Title 6—Domestic Security** | |
| **Chapter 1—Homeland Security Organization** | |
| § 331 | Treatment of charitable trusts for members of the armed services and other governmental organizations |
| **Title 10—Armed Forces** | |
| **Subtitle A—General Military Law** **Part I—Organization and General Military Powers** **Chapter 2—Department of Defense** | |
| § 118a | Quadrennial quality of life review |
| **Part II—Personnel** **Chapter 55—Medical and Dental Care** | |
| § 1108 | Health care coverage through federal employees' health benefits program: demonstration project |
| **Chapter 73—Annuities based on Retired or Retainer Pay** *Subchapter II—Survivor Benefit Plan* | |
| § 1448a | Election to discontinue participation: one-year opportunity after second anniversary of commencement of payment of retired pay |
| **Chapter 88—Military Family Care Programs and Military Child Care** *Subchapter II—Military Child Care* | |

| | |
|---|---|
| § 1798 | Child care services and youth program services for dependents: financial assistance for providers |
| **Title 37—Pay and Allowances of The Uniformed Services** | |
| **Chapter 7—Allowances** | |
| § 403 | Basic allowance for housing |
| § 407 | Travel and transportation allowances: dislocation allowance |
| § 411f | Travel and transportation allowances: transportation for survivors of deceased member to attend the member's burial ceremonies |
| § 427 | Family separation allowance |

CATEGORY 5—EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND RELATED STATUTORY PROVISIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 29—Labor** | |
| **Chapter 30—Workforce Investment Systems** | |
| ***Subchapter I—Workforce Investment Definitions*** | |
| § 2801 | Definitions |
| **Subchapter IV—National Programs** | |
| § 2918 | National emergency grants |
| **Title 30—Mineral Lands and Mining** | |
| **Chapter 25—Surface Mining Control and Reclamation** | |
| ***Subchapter VII—Administrative and Miscellaneous Provisions*** | |
| § 1304 | Surface owner protection |
| **Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare** | |
| **Chapter 46—Justice System Improvement** | |
| ***Subchapter XII—Public Safety Officers' Death Benefits*** | |
| ***Part B—Educational Assistance to Dependents of Civilian Federal Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Disabled in the Line of Duty*** | |
| § 3796d | Purposes |
| § 3796d-1 | Basic eligibility |
| **Chapter 84—Department of Energy** | |
| ***Subchapter XVI—Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program*** | |
| § 7384s | Compensation and benefits to be provided |
| § 7384u | Separate treatment of certain uranium employees |
| § 7385c | Exclusivity of remedy against the United States and against contractors and subcontractors |

CATEGORY 6—IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND ALIENS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 8—Aliens and Nationality** | |
| **Chapter 12—Immigration and Nationality** | |
| ***Subchapter II—Immigration*** | |
| ***Part II—Admission Qualifications fFor Aliens; Travel Control of Citizens And Aliens*** | |
| § 1183a | Requirements for sponsor's affidavit of support |
| **Part IV—Inspection, Apprehension, Examination, Exclusion, and Removal** | |
| § 1227 | General classes of deportable aliens |
| § 1229a | Removal proceedings |
| § 1229b | Cancellation of removal; adjustment of status |
| § 1229c | Voluntary departure |
| ***Part IX—Miscellaneous*** | |
| § 1367 | Penalties for disclosure of information |
| § 1375 | Mail-order bride business |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chapter 14—Restricting Welfare and Public Benefits for Aliens** | |
| ***Subchapter IV—General Provisions*** | |
| § 1641 | Definitions |
| **Chapter 15—Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform** | |
| ***Subchapter V—Foreign Students and Exchange Visitors*** | |
| § 1761 | Foreign student monitoring program |
| **Title 19—Customs Duties** | |
| **Chapter 24—Bipartisan Trade Promotion** | |
| § 3805*note* | United States—Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act |

**CATEGORY 7--INDIANS**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 25—Indians** | |
| **Chapter 18—Indian Health Care** | |
| ***Subchapter II—Health Services*** | |
| § 1621h | Mental health services |
| **Chapter 24—Indian Land Consolidation** | |
| § 2206 | Descent and distribution |
| § 2216 | Trust and restricted land transactions |
| **Chapter 43—Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination** | |
| § 4103 | Definitions |
| ***Subchapter VIII—Housing Assistance for Native Hawaiians*** | |
| § 4221 | Definitions |

**CATEGORY 8—TRADE, COMMERCE, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 12—Banks and Banking** | |
| **Chapter 13—National Housing** | |
| § 1701q | Supportive housing for the elderly |
| | ***Subchapter II—Mortgage Insurance*** |
| § 1707 | Definitions |
| § 1713 | Rental housing insurance |
| § 1715e | Cooperative housing insurance |
| **Chapter 17—Bank Holding Companies** | |
| § 1841 | Definitions |
| **Chapter 31—National Consumer Cooperative Bank** | |
| ***Subchapter I—Establishment and Operation*** | |
| § 3015 | Eligibility of cooperatives |
| **Chapter 32—Foreign Bank Participation in Domestic Markets** | |
| § 3106a | Compliance with state and federal laws |
| **Title 15—Commerce and Trade** | |
| **Chapter 14A—Aid to Small Business** | |
| § 632 | Small business concern |
| **Chapter 14B—Small Business Investment Program** | |
| ***Subchapter V—Loans to State and Local Development Companies*** | |
| § 696 | Loans for plant acquisition, construction, conversion, and expansion |
| **Chapter 41—Consumer Credit Protection** | |
| ***Subchapter IV—Equal Credit Opportunity*** | |
| § 1691 | Scope of prohibition |

## CATEGORY 9—FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 7—Agriculture** | |
| **Chapter 50—Agricultural Credit** | |
| ***Subchapter VI—Delta Regional Authority*** | |
| § 2009aa-1 | Delta Regional Authority |
| ***Subchapter VII—Northern Great Plains Regional Authority*** | |
| § 2009bb-1 | Northern Great Plains Regional Authority |
| ***Subchapter IX—Rural Strategic Investment Program*** | |
| § 2009dd-3 | National Board on rural America |

## CATEGORY 10—CRIMES AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 18—Crimes and Criminal Procedure** | |
| **Part I—Crimes** | |
| **Chapter 46—Forfeiture** | |
| § 983 | General rules for civil forfeiture proceedings |
| **Chapter 110A—Domestic Violence** | |
| § 2261A | Interstate stalking |
| **Title 20** | |
| **Chapter 28—Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance** | |
| ***Subchapter VIII—Miscellaneous*** | |
| § 1152 | Grants to combat violent crimes against women on campuses |
| **Title 28—Judiciary and Judicial Procedure** | |
| **Part V—Procedure** | |
| **Chapter 115—Evidence; Documentary** | |
| § 1738C | Certain acts, records, and proceedings and the effect thereof |
| **Title 42—The Public Health And Welfare** | |
| **Chapter 135—Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement** | |
| ***Subchapter III—Violence against Women*** | |
| ***Subpart 3—Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement*** | |
| ***Part C—Civil Rights for Women*** | |
| § 13981 | Civil rights |
| ***Part D—Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act*** | |
| ***Subpart 1—Education and Training for Judges and Court Personnel in State Courts*** | |
| § 13992 | Training provided by grants |

## CATEGORY 11—LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND PAYMENTS IN AGRICULTURE

*No new provisions in this category of statutes.*

## CATEGORY 12—FEDERAL NATURAL RESOURCES AND RELATED STATUTORY PROVISIONS

*No new provisions in this category of statutes.*

CATEGORY 13—MISCELLANEOUS STATUTORY PROVISIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title 20—Education** | |
| **Chapter 70—Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools** | |
| ***Subchapter II—Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals*** | |
| ***Part C—Innovation for Teacher Quality*** | |
| ***Subpart 1—Transition to Teaching*** | |
| § 6674 | Participation agreement and financial assistance |
| ***Subchapter VII—Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs*** | |
| ***Part B—Native Hawaiian Education*** | |
| § 7512 | Findings |
| **Title 22—Foreign Relations and Intercourse** | |
| **Chapter 75—Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation** | |
| **Subchapter I—General Provisions** | |
| § 6713 | Civil liability of the United States |

## APPENDIX 2

## Tables of Statutory Provisions Identified in 1997 Report as Involving Marital Status That Have Been Repealed or Amended to Remove Reference to Marital Status

*Category 1—Social Security and Related Programs, Housing, and Food Stamps*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Regulations pertaining to garnishments | 42 U.S.C. §§661-662 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 104-193, § 362(b)(1), effective February 22, 1997, 110 Stat. 2246. |

*Category 3—Taxation*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Collapsible corporations | 26 U.S.C. § 341 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 108-27, § 302(e), May 28, 2003, 117 Stat. 763. |
| Rollover of gain on sale of principal residence | 26 U.S.C. § 1034 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-34, § 312(b), Aug. 5, 1997, 111 Stat. 839. |
| Tax on excess distribution from qualified retirement plans | 26 U.S.C. § 4980A | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-34, § 1073(a), Aug. 7, 1997, 111 Stat. 948. |

*Category 4—Federal Civilian and Military Service Benefits*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Employment of retired members of the uniformed services; reduction in retired or retainer pay | 5 U.S.C. § 5532 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 106-65, § 651(a)(1), Oct. 1, 1999, 113 Stat. 664. |
| Assistance to separated members to obtain certification and employment as teachers or employment as teachers' aides | 10 U.S.C. § 1151 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 106-655, § 1707(a)(1), Oct. 5, 1999, 113 Stat. 823. |
| Military child care employees | 10 U.S.C. § 1792 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-261, § 1106, Oct. 17, 1998, 112 Stat. 2142; reference to marital status removed. |
| Job training partnership, application of federal law | 29 U.S.C. § 1706 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-220, § 199(b) (2), effective July 1, 2000, 112 Stat. 1059. |
| Rights, benefits, privileges, and immunities; exercise of authority of Secretary of Commerce or designee (National Ocean Survey employees) | 33 U.S.C. § 857a | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 107-372, § 271(2), Dec. 19, 2002, 116 Stat. 3094 and replaced with similar provisions that omit any reference to marital status. See 33 U.S.C. 3071 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps - Rights and benefits). |

*Category 5—Employment Benefits and Related Statutory Provisions*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Youth training program for the disadvantaged | 29 U.S.C. § 1644 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-220, § 199(b)(2), effective July 1, 2000, 112 Stat. 1059. |
| Job Corps—Allowances and support | 29 U.S.C. § 1699 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-220, § 199(b)(2), effective July 1, 2000, 112 Stat. 1059. |
| Labor market information | 29 U.S.C. § 1752 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-220, § 199(b)(2), effective July 1, 2000, 112 Stat. 1059. |

*Category 6—Immigration, Naturalization, and Aliens*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Suspension of deportation of aliens | 8 U.S.C. § 1251 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 308(b)(7), Sep. 30, 1996, 110 Stat. 3009-615. |

*Category 9—Financial Disclosure and Conflict of Interest*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Corporation—Board of Directors, Employees, and Facilities | 7 U.S.C. § 5903 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 107-171, § 6201(a), May 13, 2002, 116 Stat. 418. |

*Category 10—Crimes and Family Violence*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Interstate violation of a protection order | 18 U.S.C. § 2262 | Amended by Pub. L. 106-386, § 1107, Oct. 28, 2000, 114 Stat. 1464; reference to marital status removed. |
| Narcotic addict rehabilitation—definitions | 42 U.S.C. § 3411 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 106-310, § 3405(b), Oct. 17, 2000, 114 Stat. 1221. |
| Model state leadership grants for domestic violence intervention | 42 U.S.C. § 10415 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 108-36, § 410, June 25, 2003, 117 Stat. 827. |

*Category 11—Loans, Guarantees, and Payments in Agriculture*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Paul Douglas Teaching Scholarships—exceptions to repayment provisions | 20 U.S.C. § 1104g | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-244, § 501, October 7, 1998, 112 Stat. 1581; reference to marital status removed. |
| Faculty Development Fellowship Program—exceptions to repayment provisions | 20 U.S.C. § 1134r-5 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-244, § 701, October 7, 1998,112 Stat. 1581. |

*Category 13—Miscellaneous Statutory Provisions*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Vocational education state plans | 20 U.S.C. § 2323 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-332, § 1(b), October 31, 1998,112 Stat. 3076; reference to marital status removed. |
| Vocational education definitions | 20 U.S.C. § 2471 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-332, § 1(b), October 31, 1998, 112 Stat. 3076; reference to marital status removed. |
| Agricultural Hall of Fame | 36 U.S.C. § 977 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-354, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 3238; reference to marital status removed. |
| Audits of Federally Chartered Corporations | 36 U.S.C. § 1101 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-225, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1253; reference to marital status removed. |
| Gold Star Wives of America | 36 U.S.C. § 1602 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-225, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1253; replaced provision's reference to "gold wives" with "corporation". (The name of the organization continues to be the Gold Star Wives of America.) |
| Navy Wives Clubs of America | 36 U.S.C. § 2802 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-225, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1436; replaced provision's reference to "Navy Wives" with "corporation". (The name of the organization continues to be the Navy Wives Clubs of America.) |
| Aviation Hall of Fame | 36 U.S.C. § 4307 and § 4309 | Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-225, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1312. These provisions' references to "survivors" were deleted. |
| Membership of Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission | 36 U.S.C. § 169j-3 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 105-225, § 6, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1253. |
| Testing and other early intervention services for state prisoners | 42 U.S.C. § 300ff-48 | Repealed by Pub. L. No. 106-345, § 301(a), Oct. 20, 2000, 114 Stat. 1345. |
| Programs for older Americans—Demonstration projects | 42 U.S.C. § 3035a | Provision was omitted by Pub. L. No. 106-501, Nov. 13, 2001, 114 Stat. 2257. |

## APPENDIX 3

### Tables of Statutory Provisions Identified in 1997 Report as Involving Marital Status That Have Been Relocated in the United States Code

*Category 1—Social Security and Related Programs, Housing, and Food Stamps*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Alien's eligibility for benefits | 42 U.S.C. § 615 | Relocated to 42 U.S.C. § 608(f) |

*Category 2—Veterans' Benefits*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Medical care for survivors and dependents of certain veterans | 38 U.S.C. § 1713 | Relocated to 38 U.S.C. § 1781 |

*Category 4—Federal Civilian and Military Service Benefits*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| House of Representatives Child Care Center | 40 U.S.C. § 184g | Relocated to 2 U.S.C. § 2062 |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration commissary privileges | 33 U.S.C. § 857-4 | Relocated to 33 U.S.C. § 3074 |
| Gratuities for survivors of deceased House employees; computation | 40 U.S.C. § 166b-4 | Relocated to 2 U.S.C. § 125 |
| Senate employee child care benefits | 40 U.S.C. § 214d | Relocated to 2 U.S.C. § 2063 |

*Category 5—Employment Benefits and Related Statutory Provisions*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Job training partnership—definitions | 29 U.S.C. § 1503 | Relocated to 29 U.S.C. § 2801 |

*Category 6—Immigration, Naturalization, and Aliens*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Deportable aliens | 8 U.S.C. § 1251 | Relocated to 8 U.S.C. § 1227 |

*Category 7—Indians*

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Indian land consolidation—Descent and distribution | 25 U.S.C. § 2205 | Relocated to 25 U.S.C. § 2206 |

**Category 9—Financial Disclosure and Conflict of Interest**

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Appalachian Regional Commission—personal financial interests | 40 U.S.C. § 108 | Relocated to 40 U.S.C. § 14309 |

***Category 10—Crimes and Family Violence***

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Family violence prevention and Services—definitions | 40 U.S.C. § 10408 | Relocated to 40 U.S.C. § 10421 |

***Category 13—Miscellaneous Statutory Provisions***

| Subject | 1997 Statutory Citation | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Marine Corps League | 36 U.S.C. § 57a | Relocated to chapter 2301 § 140102 |
| Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States | 36 U.S.C. § 113 | Relocated to chapter 2301 § 230102 |
| Legion of Valor of the United States of America | 36 U.S.C. § 633 | Relocated to chapter 1303 § 130302 |
| Veterans of World War I of the United States of America | 36 U.S.C. § 763 | Relocated to chapter 2303 § 230302 |
| The Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States | 36 U.S.C. § 793 and § 799 | Relocated to chapter 405 § 40502 and § 40506 |
| Blinded Veterans Association | 36 U.S.C. § 859 | Relocated to chapter 303 § 30307 |
| National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic | 36 U.S.C. § 1005 | Relocated to chapter 1537 § 153703 |
| Gold Star Wives of America | 36 U.S.C. § 1601 | Relocated to chapter 805 § 80502 |
| American Ex-Prisoners of War | 36 U.S.C. § 2103 | Relocated to chapter 209 § 20903 |
| Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc. | 36 U.S.C. § 2603 | Relocated to chapter 401 § 40103 |
| Navy Wives Clubs of America | 36 U.S.C. §2801 and § 2803 | Relocated to chapter 1545, § 154502 and §154503. |
| Army and Navy Union of the United States | 36 U.S.C. § 3903 | Relocated to chapter 229 § 22903 |
| Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States | 36 U.S.C. § 4003 | Relocated to chapter 1547 § 4003 |
| Retired Enlisted Association, Incorporated | 36 U.S.C. § 5103 | Relocated to chapter 1903 § 190303 |
| National Fallen Firefighters Foundation | 36 U.S.C. § 5201 | Relocated to Chapter 1513 § 151302 |
| Public Health Service grants for services of substance abusers | 42 U.S.C. § 280d | Relocated to 42 U.S.C. § 290bb-25 |
| Programs for older Americans—state plans | 42 U.S.C. § 3035 | Relocated to 42 U.S.C. § 3027 |

APPENDIX 4—CATEGORIES OF STATUTORY PROVISIONS

CATEGORY 1—SOCIAL SECURITY AND RELATED PROGRAMS, HOUSING, AND FOOD STAMPS

This category includes the major federal health and welfare programs, particularly those considered entitlements, such as Social Security retirement and disability benefits, food stamps, welfare, and Medicare and Medicaid. Most of these provisions are found in Title 42 of the United States Code, Public Health and Welfare; food stamp legislation is in Title 7, Agriculture.

CATEGORY 2—VETERANS' BENEFITS

Veterans' benefits, which are codified in Title 38 of the United States Code, include pensions, indemnity compensation for service-connected deaths, medical care, nursing home care, right to burial in veterans' cemeteries, educational assistance, and housing. Husbands or wives of veterans have many rights and privileges by virtue of the marital relationship.

CATEGORY 3—TAXATION

While the distinction between married and unmarried status is pervasive in federal tax law, terms such as ''husband,'' ''wife,'' or ''married'' are not defined. However, marital status figures in federal tax law in provisions as basic as those giving married taxpayers the option to file joint or separate income tax returns. It is also seen in the related provisions prescribing different tax consequences, depending on whether a taxpayer is married filing jointly, married filing separately, unmarried but the head of a household, or unmarried and not the head of a household.

CATEGORY 4—FEDERAL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY SERVICE BENEFITS

This category includes statutory provisions dealing with current and retired federal officers and employees, members of the Armed Forces, elected officials, and judges, in which marital status is a factor. Typically these provisions address the various health, leave, retirement, survivor, and insurance benefits provided by the United States to those in federal service and their families.

CATEGORY 5—EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND RELATED PROVISIONS

Marital status comes into play in many different ways in federal laws relating to employment in the private sector. Most provisions appear in Title 29 of the United States Code, Labor. However, others are in Title 30, Mineral Lands and Mining; Title 33, Navigation and Navigable Waters; and Title 45, Railroads. This category includes laws that address the rights of employees under employer-sponsored employee benefit plans; that provide for continuation of employer-sponsored health benefits after events like the death or divorce of the employee; and that give employees the right to unpaid leave in order to care for a seriously ill spouse. In addition, Congress has extended special benefits in connection with certain occupations, like mining and public safety.

CATEGORY 6—IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND ALIENS

This category includes federal statutory provisions governing the conditions under which noncitizens may enter and remain in the United States, be deported, or become citizens. Most are found in Title 8, Aliens and Nationality. The law gives special consideration to spouses of immigrant and nonimmigrant aliens in a wide variety of circumstances. Under immigration law, aliens may receive special status by virtue of their employment, and that treatment may extend to their spouses. Also, spouses of aliens granted asylum can be given the same status if they accompany or join their spouses.

CATEGORY 7—INDIANS

The indigenous peoples of the United States have long had a special legal relationship with the federal government through treaties and laws that are classified to Title 25, Indians. Various laws set out the rights to tribal property of ''white'' men marrying ''Indian'' women, or of ''Indian'' women marrying ''white'' men. The law also outlines the descent and distribution rights for Indians' property. In addition, there are laws pertaining to health care eligibility for Indians and spouses and reimbursement of travel expenses of spouses and candidates seeking positions in the Indian Health Service.

CATEGORY 8—TRADE, COMMERCE, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

This category includes provisions concerning foreign or domestic business and commerce, in the following titles of the United States Code: Bankruptcy, Title 11; Banks and Banking Title 12; Commerce and Trade, Title 15; Copyrights, Title 17; and Customs Duties, Title 19. This category also includes the National Housing Act (rights of mortgage borrowers); the Consumer Credit Protection Act (governs wage garnishment); and the Copyright Act (spousal copyright renewal and termination rights).

CATEGORY 9—FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Federal law imposes obligations on members of Congress, employees or officers of the federal government, and members of the boards of directors of some government-related or government chartered entities, to prevent actual or apparent conflicts of interest. These individuals are required to disclose publicly certain gifts, interests, and transactions. Many of these requirements, which are found in 16 different titles of the United States Code, apply also to the individual's spouse.

CATEGORY 10—CRIMES AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

This category includes laws that implicate marriage in connection with criminal justice or family violence. The nature of these provisions varies greatly. Some deal with spouses as victims of crimes, others with spouses as perpetrators. These laws are found primarily in Title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, but some statutory provisions, dealing with crime prevention and family violence, are in Title 42, Public Health and Welfare.

CATEGORY 11—LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND PAYMENTS IN AGRICULTURE

Under many federal loan programs, a spouse's income, business interests, or assets are taken into account for purposes of determining a person's eligibility to participate in the program. In other instances, marital status is a factor in determining the amount of federal assistance to which a person is entitled or the repayment schedule. This category includes education loan programs, housing loan programs for veterans, and provisions governing agricultural price supports and loan programs that are affected by the spousal relationship.

CATEGORY 12—FEDERAL NATURAL RESOURCES AND RELATED PROVISIONS

Federal law gives special rights to spouses in connection with a variety of transactions involving federal lands and other federal property. These transactions include purchase and sale of land by the federal government and lease by the government of water and mineral rights.

CATEGORY 13—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This category comprises federal statutory provisions that do not fit readily in any of the other 12 categories. Federal provisions that prohibit discrimination on the basis of marital status are included in this category. This category also includes various patriotic societies chartered in federal law, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the Gold Star Wives of America.

---

*H.R. 2426—Domestic Partnership Benefits and Obligations Act of 2003*

Summary: H.R. 2426 would provide fringe benefits to domestic partners of federal employees. Same-sex and opposite-sex domestic partners of federal employees would be entitled to the same benefits available to spouses of federal employees. Those benefits would include survivor annuities, health insurance, life insurance, and compensation for work-related injuries. Additionally, H.R. 2426 would amend the Internal Revenue Code by exempting domestic partner benefits from federal income taxes.

CBO estimates that enacting the bill would increase direct spending by $137 million over the 2004–2008 period and by $242 million over the next 10 years. Discretionary spending under the bill would increase by $525 million over the 2004–2008 period and by about $1.3 billion over the next 10 years, assuming appropriation of the necessary funds. The bill would also affect federal revenues; those effects would have to be estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

H.R. 2426, as introduced, would extend benefits to domestic partners of active federal employees and of current and prospective retirees. At the request of the sponsor, this estimate excludes the cost of extending such benefits to domestic partners of currently retired federal employees. (Including benefits for the domestic partners of currently retired federal employees would increase direct spending by an additional $448 million over the 2004–2008 period and $1.4 billion over the 2004–2013 period; it would not result in additional discretionary costs.)

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 2426 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 550 (health) and 600 (income security).

| | Outlays in millions of dollars, by fiscal year— | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increase in FEHBP Benefits (future retirees) | 4 | 9 | 14 | 19 | 25 | 32 | 40 | 49 | 58 | 69 |
| Net Increase in FECA Outlays [1] | 2 | 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Postal Service FEHBP and FECA Costs (off-budget) | 54 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduction in Survivor Annuity Payments | −3 | −7 | −10 | −13 | −17 | −21 | −25 | −29 | −32 | −36 |
| Total, Direct Spending | 57 | 63 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 20 | 26 | 32 |
| CHANGES IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Costs for FEHBP Benefits (active employees) | 91 | 96 | 102 | 109 | 117 | 125 | 134 | 143 | 152 | 162 |

| | Outlays in millions of dollars, by fiscal year— | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Agency Costs for FECA | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Total, Discretionary Spending | 92 | 97 | 105 | 112 | 120 | 128 | 137 | 146 | 155 | 165 |

[1] The outlays shown are net of receipts from federal agencies.
* = Less than $500,000.
Notes: FEHBP = Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. FECA = Federal Employees Compensation Act. Components may not sum to totals because of rounding. This estimate assumes that the bill will be enacted by October 2003. The estimate does not reflect changes to the Internal Revenue Code; those effects would have to be estimated by JCT.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 2426 will be enacted by the end of fiscal year 2003 and that domestic partners would be eligible to begin receiving benefits in November 2003. CBO estimates that about 2 percent of federal employees would elect to provide health care and retirement benefits for a domestic partner if given the opportunity. Approximately 83 percent of the costs would come from partners in opposite-sex partnerships and approximately 17 percent of costs derive from partners in same-sex partnerships. These figures are based on information from state and local governments as well as corporations that have adopted similar policies. In addition, domestic partners of workers who retire after the bill goes into effect would be eligible to opt for survivor annuity coverage, as well as retiree health care benefits.

*Direct spending*

Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) for Future Retirees. H.R. 2426 would extend eligibility for health benefits to the domestic partners of retiring federal employees. An employee who retires after enactment of the bill would be allowed to maintain family coverage for his or her domestic partner. Unlike premiums for current workers, the government's share of health care premiums for retirees is classified as direct spending. For each year of the 2004–2013 period, CBO projects that approximately 1,000 additional family coverage policies would be added to the FEHBP by retiring non-Postal Service workers choosing to cover domestic partners. As a result, direct spending would increase by $71 million over the next five years and by $319 million over the next 10 years. The costs associated with providing benefits to the domestic partners of both active and retiring Postal Service workers are discussed below.

Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) Benefits. FECA provides compensation to federal civilian employees for disability due to personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty. Married workers currently receive slightly higher FECA benefits for wage replacement than do single workers. Additionally, if an employee dies of an employment-related injury or disease, his or her spouse receives monthly compensation equal to 50 percent of the deceased employee's salary. CBO projects that H.R. 2426, if enacted, would provide FECA benefits to approximately 1,200 domestic partners of non-postal federal employees each year. Additional costs would total $35 million; agencies would have to cover those costs over time from appropriated funds (see below). Because increases in agency contributions would lag behind the increased costs, there would be a net increase in direct spending of $4 million over the 2004–2013 period.

Postal Service Employees. Postal Service employees would also be eligible for domestic partner coverage under H.R. 2426. CBO estimates that providing health benefits to the domestic partners of active postal workers would result in about 11,000 postal employees moving from individual to family coverage plans. Additionally, CBO anticipates that approximately 500 of the postal workers who would retire each year would maintain FEHB coverage for their partners. Together, these benefits would cost $311 million over the 2004–2008 period and $814 million over the 2004–2013 period. Additionally, extending FECA benefits to Postal Service employees would cost $15 million over the next five years and $30 million over the next 10 years.

The operations of the Postal Service are classified as off-budget (like Social Security), although the total federal budget records the agency's net spending (outlays less offsetting collections). The Postal Service's mandate requires it to set postage rates to cover its operating expenses, and thus it would be expected to cover 100 percent of the increased costs associated with H.R. 2426 from postage receipts. However, the Postal Service Retirement System Funding Reform Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–18) effectively froze postage rate increases until 2006. Therefore, for the 2004–2005 period, the increased costs resulting from H.R. 2426 would not be offset by higher postal receipts. Beginning in 2006, the Postal Service would be able to raise postage rates to account for its increased costs. As a result, CBO estimates that extending FEHBP and FECA benefits to the domestic partners of Postal Service workers would increase off-budget direct spending by $113 million over the 2004–2005 period and would have no net effect after that.

Survivor Annuities. Under current law, a federal employee who is eligible to receive retirement benefits may elect to provide his or her spouse with a survivor annuity by reducing the value of the employee's annuity. Participants in the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) face different reductions and survivor annuity benefit levels than participants in the Federal Employees' Retirement System (FERS). Under both plans, those who elect survivor benefits face a reduction in their current annuity of between 5 percent and 10 percent.

Under H.R. 2426, federal employees who retire would be able to choose to reduce the value of their own annuities in order to provide survivor annuities for their domestic partners. CBO estimates that 85 percent of federal employees with domestic partners would elect survivor benefits if given the opportunity. On that basis, CBO projects that approximately 2,000 newly retired federal employees each year would add survivor annuities for their domestic partners and thus collect smaller annuities. However, some of these individuals would die and their partners would begin collecting survivor benefits. Over the next 10 years, the savings from the reduction in retirees' annuities would outweigh the additional costs for survivors' annuities. CBO estimates that direct spending would decrease by $51 million over the 2004–2008 period and by $194 million over the 2004–2013 period.

Coverage of Current Retirees. H.R. 2426, as introduced, would extend domestic partner benefits to all current federal retirees, as well as active workers. However, the sponsor indicated to CBO that this was not the intent of H.R. 2426 and requested that CBO estimate the costs of the bill under the assumption that it would be changed to include only active workers and those who retire after the bill's enactment. The above estimate reflects that assumed change. If all current retirees were to receive the same benefits that new retirees would receive under H.R. 2426, the cost of the bill would increase by an additional $448 million over the 2004–2008 period and $1.4 billion over the 2004–2013 period.

*Discretionary spending*

Health Benefits for Active Employees. H.R. 2426 would allow federal employees to add domestic partners to their health insurance policies. CBO estimates that about 80 percent of employees who add a domestic partner would switch from individual coverage to family coverage. Federal agencies pay about 72 percent of health-care premiums for active employees; thus, as premiums rise, so do agency contributions. In 2004 family coverage policies for active employees are projected to cost the federal government approximately $3,800 more than individual coverage policies. CBO estimates that providing additional family coverage policies to about 24,000 non-postal employees who would elect domestic partner coverage would increase spending subject to appropriation by $515 million over the 2004–2008 period and by $1.2 billion over the 2004–2013 period.

Federal Employees' Compensation Act Benefits. As discussed under the direct spending section, this bill would result in increased spending for federal workers' compensation. The reimbursement of FECA expenses paid by the Department of Labor comes from discretionary salary and expense accounts of federal agencies. Because these expenses are ultimately borne by the employing agency, CBO estimates discretionary spending would increase by $11 million over the 2004–2008 period and by $26 million over the 2004–2013 period to pay for these benefits.

Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance (FEGLI) Benefits. Under current law, the federal government pays one-third of basic life insurance premiums and employees pay two-thirds. Optional coverage that provides benefits above the basic level is paid for entirely by the employee. H.R. 2426 would allow federal employees to purchase Option C coverage, which would insure a domestic partner for up to $25,000. The premium for this option is actuarially sound; over time, premiums paid in to the account equal the payouts from the account. While the cash flow in any given year could be positive or negative, the overall impact on the federal budget would be negligible.

*Tax changes*

H.R. 2426 contains provisions that would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Those changes would likely have tax implications that CBO does not estimate. The Joint Committee on Taxation normally supplies the estimate of the tax effects of legislation.

Estimate prepared by: Van Swearingen and Geoff Gerhardt.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). 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.

## NONPROLIFERATION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in January 2001, a well-respected and bipartisan task force looked at the threats facing the United States and recommended increasing nonproliferation funding under the Department of Energy to $3 billion per year for the next 10 years. As they stated in their report, the most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable materiel in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation-states and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home.

This year, now, 3 years after that report, the Department of Energy and Department of Defense nonproliferation budgets only contained $1.8 billion combined for nuclear nonproliferation. This is simply not enough.

I offered an amendment that would increase the amount of funding for nonproliferation by a combined $200 million, bringing the total for nonproliferation to $2 billion this year. Regrettably, this amendment was not made in order.

On the Defense Department side, our amendment would have added $50 million for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, or Nunn-Lugar. The goal of Nunn-Lugar is to lessen the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, to deactivate and destroy these weapons and to help scientists, formerly engaged in the production of such weapons, start working for peace. To date, Nunn-Lugar has reportedly helped destroy over 6,000 warheads.

The Defense Department authorization bill contained a $41.6 million decrease in funds for Nunn-Lugar from last year's level. In fact, it is a $34 million decrease below the pre-September 11 level.

Last year, Congress expanded the scope of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program to countries outside of the former Soviet Union. They authorized $50 million for this purpose. The amendment would have provided this $50 million. The elimination of Libya and Iraq as states of concern have presented us with new opportunities for progress on nonproliferation, as has our improved relationship with the former Soviet Union states whose need for assistance in securing nuclear materials has never been greater.

□ 1930

In the Department of Energy, there are countless programs sorely in need of additional funding. Our amendment would have provided $40 million more for global cleanout, a program to secure and dispose of highly enriched uranium at research reactors around the globe. There are over 345 operating or shut-down research reactors in 58 countries fueled with highly enriched uranium.

The State Department has identified 24 other facilities for highly enriched uranium cleanout operations because they have enough uranium to make a nuclear weapon. Many of these facilities are guarded by little more than a night watchman and a chain link fence.

The Department of Defense authorization bill we just passed only contains $9.8 million for this program, which is only enough to clean out one site.

A recent report by the Project of Managing the Atom at Harvard University suggests Congress appropriate $40 million annually to fund global cleanout efforts. Our amendment would have met or exceeded this goal. And I have also introduced stand-alone legislation to establish a structure to prioritize the effort to clean out highly enriched uranium around the world. It would have provided funding to downblend highly enriched uranium to low enriched uranium so that it could not be used directly to make nuclear weapons, but would be suitable for nuclear power plant fuel.

Russia currently has over a thousand tons of highly enriched uranium, enough for 20,000 simple nuclear weapons. Under a 1993 U.S.-Russian agreement, Russia will convert 500 metric tons of highly enriched uranium to low enriched uranium by 2013, but this program was zeroed out in the Department of Energy's budget. We would have changed that.

According to the Stockholm Peace Research Institute, only a quarter of Russia's nuclear sites are properly secured. We would have added funding for global nuclear security. We would have added funding for security upgrades at nine Russian weapons complexes.

The irony of removing this funding, of not sensing this urgency, after going to war in Iraq over weapons of mass destruction stockpiles we have not found, when we know there are massive stockpiles in the former Soviet Union for which we have cooperative arrangements to secure and destroy, could not be more apparent. The urgency could not be greater.

We would have paid for these programs, we would have provided for the national defense, and this must be an urgency.

Osama bin Laden has declared that the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction is a religious duty. After the Taliban was defeated, blueprints of a crude nuclear weapon were found in a deserted al Qaeda headquarters in Afghanistan.

My amendment would not have gotten us all the way to the $3 billion recommended by the Baker-Cutler Commission, but it was an important first step. We must continue that process now in the conference committee, and I would urge the conferees to take up the cause of nonproliferation with the urgency it deserves.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, as Senator Nunn put it so well, the most effective, least expensive way to prevent nuclear terrorism is to lock down and secure weapons and fissile materials in every country, in every facility that has them.

## THE 63RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEROIC BATTLE OF CRETE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly today to celebrate the 63rd anniversary of the Battle of Crete, a World War II event of epic proportions that profoundly impacted on the determination of many countries to resist the aggression of Nazi Germany.

It is a story of a battered, but brave, group of individuals thrown together in a combined effort to halt the domination of a smaller and weaker nation by a larger more powerful aggressor. One of those individuals, a true hero of the battle, is with us tonight in the gallery, Mr. George Tzitzikas, who now lives in California.

Today, more than half a century later, the heroic event that took place in the Battle of Crete remains etched in the memory of people around the world. In commemoration of this anniversary, and for the benefit of future generations, I will share a brief account of these events as they unfolded.

Early on the morning of May 20, 1941, Crete became the theater of the first and largest German airborne operation of the war. The skies above Crete were filled with more than 8,000 Nazi paratroopers landing in a massive invasion of the island, which was subjected to heavy bombing and attacks in what became known as Operation Mercury.

Old men, women, and children participated, and used whatever makeshift weapons they could find. They used sticks, sickles, and even their bare hands to fight those soldiers already on the ground. Most of them were illiterate villagers; but their intuition, honed by the mortal risk they were facing, led them to fight with courage and bravery. ''Aim for the legs, and you will get them in the heart,'' was the popular motto that summarized their hastily acquired battle experience.

Although the Germans captured the island in 10 days, they paid a heavy price. Of the 8,100 paratroopers involved in this operation, close to 4,000 were killed and 1,600 were wounded. So injured were the German units that they never again attempted an airborne assault of the magnitude launched at Crete. In fact, it is a lesson taught in almost every major military academy in the world on what not to do.

In retaliation for the losses they incurred, the Nazis spread punishment, terror, and death on the innocent civilians of the island. More than 2,000 Cretans were executed during the first month alone, and thousands more later.

Despite these atrocities for the 4 years following the Allied withdrawal from the island, the people of Crete put up a courageous guerrilla resistance, aided by a few British and Allied officers and troops who remained. Those involved were known as the Andartes, the Rebels.

The German terror campaign was meant to break the fighting spirit and morale of the Andartes. Besides the random and frequent executions, German soldiers used other means to achieve their goal. These actions only made the Cretans more ferocious in their quest for freedom.

Even in the face of certain death, while standing in line to be executed, Cretans did not beg for their lives. This shocked the German troops. Kurt Student, the German paratrooper commander who planned the invasion, said of the Cretans, ''I have never seen such a defiance of death.''

Finally, the Cretan people participated in one of the most daring operations that brought shame and humiliation to the German occupation forces and exhilaration and hope to the enslaved peoples of Europe. Major-General Von Kreipe, commander of all German forces in Crete, was abducted from his own headquarters in April 1944, and transferred to a POW camp in England. The German troops had never encountered such resistance.

Hitler had initially sent 12,000 troops to Crete, thinking the occupation would be swift. By the end of the 3½ years of occupation, Hitler had sent a total of 100,000 troops to confront the little more than 5,000 Cretan Andarte fighters. These German troops could have been deployed somewhere else. More German troops were lost during the occupation of Crete than in France, Yugoslavia, and Poland combined.

Most importantly, as a result of the battle in Crete, Hitler's master plan to invade Russia before the coming of winter had to be postponed, which resulted in the deaths of many German troops who were not properly prepared to survive the harsh Russian winter.

Mr. Speaker, we must always remember that as long as there are people willing to sacrifice their lives for the just cause of defending the integrity and freedom of their country, there is always hope for a better tomorrow.

May we take inspiration from the shining example of the people of Crete in ensuring that this is, indeed, the case.

Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly today to celebrate the 63rd anniversary of the Battle of Crete, a World War II event of epic proportions that profoundly impacted on the determination of many countries to resist the aggression of Nazi Germany. It is a story of a battered but brave group of individuals thrown together in a combined effort to halt the domination of a smaller, weaker nation by a larger more powerful aggressor. One of those individuals, a true hero of the battle, is with us tonight in the gallery, Mr. George Tzitzikas who now lives in California. Amidst the cataclysm that engulfed the countries of Europe at the time, it seems now preposterous that a small island dared to stand up to the aggressor to preserve its freedom and defend its honor. Today, more than half a century later, the heroic events that took place in the Battle of Crete remain etched in the memory of people around the world. In commemoration of this anniversary, and for the benefit of future generations, I will share a brief account of these events as they unfolded.

In early April 1941, the German army rushed to the aid of their defeated ally, Italy, and invaded Greece. Following a valiant struggle, Greek forces had been pushed entirely off the continent and were forced to take refuge on the island of Crete.

The German army then looked covetously across the sea to Crete because of the British airfields on the island, which could be used by the Allies for air strikes against the oil fields of Rumania, thereby denying this vital war commodity to Hitler's forces now preparing for their attack on Russia. If captured, it would also provide air and sea bases from which the Nazis could dominate the eastern Mediterranean and launch air attacks against Allied forces in northern Africa. In fact, the Nazi high command envisioned the capture of Crete to the first of a series of assaults leading to the Suez Canal. Hitler intended a short, one month, campaign, starting in March. On successful completion, his troops would be re-assigned to Russia.

Crete's defenses at the time had been badly neglected due to the deployment of Allied forces in North Africa. General Bernard Freyberg of the New Zealand Division was appointed by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill as commander of a small contingent of Allied troops which had been dispatched to the island a few months before and re-enforced by additional troops who had retreated from the Greek mainland.

Early on the morning of May 20, 1941, Crete became the theater of the first and largest German airborne operation of the war. The skies above Crete were filled with more than eight thousand Nazi paratroopers, landing in a massive invasion of the island, which was subjected to heavy bombing and attacks in what became known as "Operation Mercury." Waves of bombers pounded the Allied positions followed by a full-scale airborne assault. Elite paratroopers and glider-borne infantry units fell upon the rag-tag Allied soldiers and were met with ferocious resistance from the Allied troops and the Cretan population.

Although General Freyberg had decided not to arm the Cretans because they were believed to be anti-royalist, they fought bravely with whatever was at hand during the invasion. As soon as the battle broke out, the people of Crete volunteered to serve in the militia. Centuries of oppression and several revolts against Venetians and Turks had taught them that freedom is won and preserved by sacrifice, and there was hardly a family without a gun stashed somewhere in the house. For the first time, the Germans met stiff partisan resistance.

War-seasoned men joined the regular troops in the effort to repel the invader. Old men, women and children participated and used whatever makeshift weapons they could find. They pointed their antiquated guns at the descending German paratroopers. They used sticks, sickles and even their bare hands, to fight those soldiers already on the ground. Most of them were illiterate villagers but their intuition, honed by the mortal risk they were facing, led them to fight with courage and bravery. "Aim for the legs and you'll get them in the heart," was the popular motto that summarized their hastily acquired battle experience.

Seven days later, the defenders of Crete—though clinging to their rocky defensive positions—knew that they would soon be overrun. The evacuation order was given, and nearly 18,000 men were rescued. These valiant survivors had bought the Allies a week's precious time free of Nazi air and sea attacks based from Crete. More importantly, they inflicted severe losses on the German airborne forces, the showpieces of the Nazi army. Although well-armed and thoroughly equipped, the Germans didn't break the Cretan's love of freedom.

Although the Germans captured the island in ten days, they paid a heavy price. Of the 8,100 paratroopers involved in this operation, close to 4,000 were killed and 1,600 were wounded. So injured were the German units that they never again attempted an airborne assault of the magnitude launched at Crete. Hitler may have won the Battle of Crete, but he lost the war. The German victory proved a hollow one, as Crete became the graveyard of the German parachute troops. In fact, it is a lesson taught in almost every major military academy in the world on what NOT to do.

In retaliation for the losses they incurred, the Nazis spread punishment, terror and death on the innocent civilians of the island. More than two thousand Cretans were executed during the first month alone and thousands more later. Despite these atrocities, for the four years following the Allied withdrawal from the island, the people of Crete put up a courageous guerrilla resistance, aided by a few British and Allied officers and troops who remained. Those involved were known as the Andartes (the Rebels).

Cretan people of all ages joined or aided the Andartes. Children would pile rocks in the roads to slow down the German convoys. They even carried messages in their schoolbooks because it was the only place that the German soldiers never looked. These messages contained information critical to the Andartes who were hiding in the mountains and would come down for midnight raids or daytime sabotages.

The German terror campaign was meant to break the fighting spirit and morale of the Andartes. Besides the random and frequent executions, German soldiers used other means to achieve their goal. They leveled many buildings in the towns and villages, destroyed religious icons, and locked hundreds of Cretans in churches for days without food or water, but nothing worked. These actions only made the Cretans more ferocious in their quest for freedom.

Even in the face of certain death while standing in line to be executed, Cretans did not beg for their lives. This shocked the German troops. Kurt Student, the German Paratrooper Commander who planned the invasion, said of the Cretans, "I have never seen such a defiance of death."

Finally, the Cretan people participated in one of the most daring operations that brought shame and humiliation to the German occupation forces and exhilaration and hope to the enslaved peoples of Europe. Major-General Von Kreipe, Commander of all German forces in Crete, was abducted from his own headquarters in April 1944 and transferred to a POW camp in England.

The German troops had never encountered such resistance. Hitler had initially sent 12,000 troops to Crete, thinking that the occupation would be swift. By the end of the three-and-a-half years of occupation, Hitler had sent a total of 100,000 troops, to confront a little more than 5,000 Cretan Andarte fighters. These German troops could have been deployed somewhere else. More German troops were lost during the occupation of Crete than in France, Yugoslavia and Poland combined.

Most importantly, as a result of the battle in Crete, Hitler's master plan to invade Russia before the coming of winter, had to be postponed, which resulted in the deaths of many German troops who were not properly prepared to survive the harsh Russian winter.

As we Americans know from our history, freedom does not come free. For their gallant resistance against the German invasion and occupation of their island, Cretans paid a stiff price. Within the first five months of the Battle of Crete, 3,500 Cretans were executed and many more were killed in the ensuring three-and-a-half years of occupation.

Mr. Speaker, there are historical reasons why we Americans appreciate the sacrifices of the Cretan people in defending their island during the Battle of Crete. We have a history replete with similar heroic events starting with our popular revolt that led to the birth of our Nation more than two centuries.

We must always remember that as long as there are people willing to sacrifice their lives for the just cause of defending the integrity and freedom of their country, there is always hope for a better tomorrow. May we take inspiration from the shining example of the people of Crete in ensuring that this is indeed the case.

## SMART SECURITY AND ABU GHRAIB SCANDAL

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the debate about the defense bill, we seem to have forgotten one very, very important thing, which should be the driving force behind every decision we make with regard to Iraq. Mr. Speaker, nearly 800 young men and women have lost their lives as a result of the conflict. Eight hundred.

We must never forget that people are dying as a result of the decisions of this House. Many of our brave soldiers will never again walk this Earth because of the choices we have made. Many more will be lame for life. Clearly, something is wrong with our Nation's policies when 800 of our soldiers have died in Iraq, most of them after our flight-clad President declared an end to major combat operations.

Something is most certainly wrong when events occur such as the abuses in Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, or even events like the deaths of five Iraqi prisoners in war-torn detention camps, as the Denver Post recently reported. The fact that these actions occurred in separate places, under the command of different interrogators, demonstrates that this is a systemic problem.

The Pentagon's response has been to court-martial the young soldiers directly responsible for these instances of torture, calling them bad apples. And what has been the response by the leaders of this country? Two weeks ago, President Bush appeared on Arab television condemning the abuses by American servicemembers and private American contractors. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld testified before the Senate and House Committee on Armed Services for the same purpose. Both men in their respective addresses tried to distance themselves from the crimes.

Mr. Speaker, President Harry Truman made famous the quote ''The buck stops here.'' President Bush would be well served to take notice of this quotation, which President Truman thought was so important that he kept it as a sign on his desk in the Oval Office.

In fact, it is becoming more apparent every day that all along both President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld may have known more than they were letting on and that the crimes committed at the prisons could have originated in the Pentagon and passed through the Oval Office.

An investigation by Newsweek magazine provides evidence that President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld, along with Attorney General John Ashcroft, may have personally agreed to a secret system of detention interrogation designed to circumnavigate the Geneva Conventions. This information was substantiated by a New Yorker magazine article, which similarly detailed a Pentagon operation known inside the intelligence community as Copper Green, which encouraged physical coercion and sexual humiliation of Iraqi prisoners in an attempt to produce intelligence about the post-war insurgency in Iraq.

Are we really to believe that the Secretary of Defense had no knowledge of the actions being taken by the soldiers under his command? And if the Secretary of Defense had absolutely no knowledge of this abuse, is that not a gigantic problem in and of itself? And if Secretary Rumsfeld did know of Copper Green, are we really to believe that nobody shared this information with the President? And if not, why not?

The buck stops with the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. The buck does not stop with the young soldiers interrogating Iraqi prisoners. The buck does not stop with Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, the U.S. general in charge of running the prisons in Iraq. The buck does not even stop with Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense. The buck stops with the President and only with the President.

There has to be a better way, because the Bush doctrine of passing the buck has been tried and it has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy, one that emphasizes brains instead of brawn, one that is consistent with the best American values.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to nonproliferation. And it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished nations with an emphasis on women's health and education.

The buck stops with the President of the United States. No more denials, no more passing the buck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

## AMERICAN INVESTMENT IN INDIA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, because the issue of American investment in India has been a particular point of debate here in the Congress, I want to say a few words about the recent elections in India and what they portend for Americans and Indians alike.

□ 1945

For many months now I have been talking about how our Nation's success in a 21st century economy is going to hinge on companies that are successfully able to invest and compete globally. It is these companies, the ones who invest in emerging overseas markets, that use global investment to maximize their efficiencies and create new opportunities right here in the United States.

Economic isolationists have tried to claim that investment in India is bad for Americans. They have claimed that new job opportunities in cities like Hyderabad and Mumbai mean job losses here at home. They have tried to tell the American people that we cannot compete with a growing Indian middle class.

As economic news from India, such as the 10 percent GDP growth rate last year, grew brighter and brighter, the isolationists' predictions of gloom grew darker and darker.

Then something unforeseen happened. Contrary to predictions, the Indian parliamentary elections resulted in the defeat of the BJP and Prime Minister Vajpayee, who had made market reform a pillar of his economic policy. A new party now claims the seat of prime minister and is working to build a majority coalition in the legislature.

The sudden, unexpected change made investors nervous and sent them into a large selling spree, in fact, the largest sell-off in the 129-year history of their market. The Sensex, the Bombay Stock Exchange's benchmark index, shed over 11 percent of its value on Monday, following 6 percent losses on the previous Friday. The 2-day loss to investors was over $65 billion.

Now, I am certainly not prepared to write off economic growth in India just yet, and despite the recent dismal days for the market there, I do not believe the Indian people are either; but the sudden uncertainty over India's long-term economic outlook reveals what this debate on foreign investment should have been about all along. The threat to the U.S. economy was never, never that the India economy is growing too much. The danger is that it might not be able to sustain and continue such economic growth.

This was a lesson we all learned, or should have been learned, in the 1980s. The economic isolationists told us that the rapidly expanding German and Japanese economies were going to devastate us, leaving America in the economic dust. But we soon discovered that if those two countries posed any economic threat to the U.S., it was that they were not able to sustain their economic growth.

Although the economic prophets of doom may have substituted India or maybe China for the Germany and Japan of the 1980s, the fundamental economic lesson is the same today as it was 20 years ago: Rapid and sustained growth by emerging trading partners is unquestionably in our best interest. A strong and growing Indian economy provides opportunities for U.S. companies to invest and become more competitive and create jobs right here at home. A growing Indian middle class demands more and more U.S. goods and services. And a prosperous India helps bring stability to that region of the world.

Most important, growth and job creation is helping to lift millions out of poverty in India, another compelling reason for us to encourage a thriving Indian economy, not a weakened one.

It is vitally important that we encourage India's new leadership to continue the market reforms that have successfully put India on the path to economic strength. So far, there have been some promising signs. The new governing Congress Party has pledged to continue the economic liberalization efforts of their predecessors. It is worth noting that this is the party that first introduced market reforms under Mr. Singh, who will likely be the new prime minister, back in the early 1990s.

Like the U.S. workers and consumers who have benefited from a stronger Indian economy, the 250 million Indians who are living in poverty have everything to gain from opening their markets even further. India has made tremendous strides in liberalizing its economy, but the fact is that India's economy is still not open enough. Significant obstacles to U.S. participation in India's economy persist: nontariff trade barriers, high tariffs, and weak protection of intellectual property rights, to name just a few.

The greater liberalization of the Indian economy will have a significant and positive impact on Americans and Indians alike. As the new government organizes and sets an economic agenda, I urge them to continue the work they began over a decade ago.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 2004]

INDIA DIMMING?

(By Swapan Dasgupta)

The Indian election upset that has unseated Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee may have one unintended victim: John Kerry. After making the loss of American jobs from outsourcing to countries like India a key part of his presidential campaign, the Democratic challenger may no longer have an easy scapegoat to rail against. Now, his suspicion of tech-savvy Indians who are speeding up their country's global integration will be shared by the new government in Delhi.

The world's largest democracy has given an astonishing verdict in an election whose outcome was thought to be a foregone conclusion. The voters rejected the Bharatiya Janata Party-led alliance that had governed since 1998. The winner was a combination of the Congress Party led by the Italian-born Sonia Gandhi, a doctrinaire Marxist bloc, and a motley group of regional outfits that have come together to assemble an alternative government.

India is no stranger to crazy coalitions forged out of sheer expediency. Since 1989, when Rajiv Gandhi was voted out of power, it has witnessed a series of coalition governments. What marks the latest experiment is not merely the uniqueness of a naturalized citizen at the helm—a development that has contributed to a flurry of Italian jokes being circulated on the mobile phone circuit—but the circumstances of its creation.

In the past, incumbents have been voted out for either their high-handedness or the perceived corruption of their governments. This was the case with Congress Prime Ministers Indira Gandhi in 1977, Rajiv Gandhi in 1989, and Narasimha Rao in 1996. This time, the rejection of Mr. Vajpayee was grounded in policy. The 2004 election was dominated by two themes: his leadership and the slogan ''India shining.'' This last may have been the creation of a clever copywriter, but it reflected the difference the Vajpayee government made over the past six years.

Aimed at kindling patriotism with feel-good economics, ''India Shining'' stressed India's IT and telecom revolutions, the roads program that will link the four corners of India, and the promise of becoming a global power by 2020. Deputy Prime Minister L.K. Advani, the government's ideologue, went on a bus journey across India publicizing ''India Shining'' and promising a government that would unleash India's potential and creative energies. To gum-chewing 21-year-olds working in call centers and poor farmers in drought-affected India, he invoked the same vision of India as one of the five largest economies in the next 20 years.

Traditionally, capitalism in India has lacked political advocacy. The BJP, a party that built itself on Hindu nationalism, tried to break the mold by grafting the image of a tremendously successful 79-year-old Mr. Vajpayee onto a buoyant economy. For years, intellectuals had complained about development not featuring on the election agenda. The BJP leadership tried to talk real economics to an electorate used to being promised state jobs and welfare schemes.

The outcome was a debacle on a scale that baffled pollster and politician alike: Mr. Vajpayee was swept out of office. In simultaneous local polls held in the southern states of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, two of India's most ardent champions of the IT industry, chief ministers Chandrababu Naidu and S.M. Krishna, were roundly defeated. Mr. Naidu was attacked for having more time for Bill Gates than for farmers and mocked for having transformed the state capital Hyderabad into ''Cyberabad.''

As the results poured in, the political class seemed united in treating the verdict as a resounding rebuff of ''India Shining'' and its symbols. On the TV, commentators joined politicians in interpreting the verdict as a rejection of the Vajpayee government's pro-business policies. ''You can't build highways bypassing the slums,'' concluded one critic of the BJP. Even the BJP's own allies were scathing. Dripping with sarcasm, Bal Thackeray, chief of the ultra-Hindu Shiv Sena, thanked Finance Minister Jaswant Singh and privatization czar Arun Shourie for contributing to the Congress victory.

Predictably, the left is gung-ho. With the Congress dependent on its 60 legislators for a majority, the two Communist parties are expected to put their regressive stamp on economic policy. Even before the celebrations were over, leftists called for an end to the privatization of the public sector, the abolition of the Disinvestment Ministry and a review of the reforms program. Regardless of whether or not the left joins in government, it will leave its antediluvian mark on the policies of the new regime.

An already jittery stock market panicked. On Friday, the Bombay Sensex fell 6% in one day and wiped out $22 billion of investors' wealth. Since the specter of political uncertainty and a possible defeat for Mr. Vajpayee first appeared on the horizon, the Sensex has fallen from 5712 and April 27 to 5069 on May 14. Foreign institutional investors have pulled out millions of rupees from the markets since the election results.

The fear of capital flight may quiet the left for a bit, but it is going to be a temporary respite. The manner in which the verdict has been interpreted will also encourage the old-style socialists within the Congress to press for higher taxes on corporate profits and luxury goods, as well as for more subsidies and government expenditure on welfare projects. The Vajpayee government's initiatives for the creation of world-class highways, reduction of the role of government and the cautious initiation of labor reforms look set to be modified, if not completely junked.

Over the past six years, India has tried to dance to a different tune. The Vajpayee government encouraged modernity and entrepreneurship, and boosted the self-confidence of a growing middle class. It tried to turn the country away from a Third World trajectory, from the sloth and mediocrity of the past, into a new India that is so feared by protectionists in the U.S. and Europe. Well, those protectionists can breathe a little easier now. India's ancient regime has struck back with a vengeance.

## A DRAFT BY ANY OTHER NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order

of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President came to Capitol Hill today to rally his Republican troops. Why did he need to do that? Well, a District Work Period is about to begin, that is why. Members of Congress are going home to face questions from their constituents. Here are some of the questions the Republicans are going to have to answer:

Why did a Republican President send our soldiers off to war without a plan? Almost 800 brave American soldiers have died and several thousand soldiers have been injured in Iraq. Well over half the casualties have occurred since the President's PR stunt on the deck of the Abraham Lincoln to announce that combat was over. If combat ended months ago, what exactly is going on in Iraq today?

Here is another question on the minds of Americans: How did the President's team in the Pentagon allow the worst atrocities in our history to occur in Iraq? New abuse revelations surface every day, but the administration keeps looking the other way as if hoping the crisis will go away is an effective strategy. It is the President's favorite tactic.

There is another question just beginning to emerge that the President and Republicans will consider radioactive, that means deny, deny, deny. The question is: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, why did the President not tell the American people we were going to reinstitute a military draft? Why did the Congress not have an opportunity to debate the issue?

Why did you reinstitute a draft without considering the bill that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and I cosponsored? At least, under our bill, young Americans would have a choice about whether they fight in Iraq or perform public service.

America needs to understand the President is not calling it a military draft. That is the White House way, call it something else and hope you get away with it. But as the saying goes, if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, then it is a duck. It is a silent draft.

Here are some of the headlines and news stories that America should know about before the Republicans arrive home to say they are doing a great job. In Seattle, ''Military Says It Might Return Some Former Soldiers to Duty.'' Here is the lead sentence. ''Hundreds of Washington residents who thought they might be done with their days in the Army may be pulled back into service in the weeks ahead.''

The Oregonian newspaper says, ''Army Does About-Face on Call-Up Readiness.'' The story says, ''Thousands of recent U.S. Army veterans nationwide were told to choose by Monday a new assignment in the Army Reserve or National Guard, meaning a potential return to active duty, or the military would decide for them.''

Rumsfeld blind-sided the Congress and the American people and the Supreme Court on the prisoner atrocities in Iraq. The Vice President and Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz did it this time. They never mentioned the new order when they briefed the Senate Committee on Armed Services the other day. Maybe they can update the Congress and comment on something else the Pentagon has ginned up.

UPI reports today that the Pentagon may use the IRS to find the Reservists. Imagine, soon American men and women can get a tax refund and orders to report for duty in one envelope. That is real government efficiency.

Thousands of soldiers were recently denied what President and the Defense Secretary promised, a one-way ticket home after a year of combat in Iraq. They were not asked, they were ordered to stay. That is no choice. That is a de facto military draft.

The President has reinstituted a military draft, but he will not tell the American people he needs more soldiers to fight his war in Iraq because he has no plan and the fighting gets bloodier every day. The President is keeping soldiers in combat for over a year. That is more than twice as long a stretch as was expected of people in the Second World War.

The United States today has a draft. No wonder the President was on Capitol Hill today trying to rally Republicans. Maybe he should draft them. At least they would see real shared sacrifice and shared risk.

Today, America's minorities bear an unfair share of the consequences of this war. The President and the Republicans will not tell us that, they will say the war is going well, the department of war is doing perfectly. Watch the evening news, read the newspaper, decide for yourself whether the President's war is going well.

Make no mistake about it, they need more soldiers and they are taking the steps to get them, whether they volunteer or not. That is the definition of a draft, Mr. Speaker. You ought to tell the President that he ought to just come right out and say it, he is going to draft people any way he can to avoid talking about it before the election.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim my Special Order speech at this time.

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

There was no objection.

## ABORTION EXCRUCIATINGLY PAINFUL TO UNBORN

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, abortion is excruciatingly painful to unborn children. It hurts. It hurts the children.

In expert testimony provided to the Northern District of the U.S. District Court in California on April 15, during the partial birth abortion trials, Dr. Sunny Anand, Director of the Pain Neurobiology Laboratory at Arkansas Children's Hospital Research Institute, explained, ''The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.''

Dr. Anand further describes before the court that the ''highest density of pain receptors per square inch of skin in human development occurs in utero,'' while still in the womb, ''from 20 to 30 weeks gestation. During this period, the epidermis is still very thin, leaving nerve fibers closer to the surface of the skin than in older neonates and adults.''

He went on to explain that the pain inhibitory mechanisms, in other words fibers which dampen and modulate the experience of pain, do not begin to develop until 32 to 34 weeks of gestation. Thus, Dr. Anand concludes, a fetus 20 to 32 weeks of gestation would experience a much more intense pain than older infants or children or adults when these groups are subjected to similar types of injury.

Dr. Anand points out on the question of fetal consciousness that more than 3 decades of research show that preterm infants are actively perceiving, learning and organizing information, and are constantly striving to regulate themselves, their environment and their experiences. All preterm infants actively approach and favor experiences that are developmentally supporting and actively avoiding experiences that are disruptive.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, Senator BROWNBACK and I have introduced legislation. In the House it is H.R. 4420, the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act. This bipartisan piece of legislation, which now has over two dozen House sponsors and 22 Senate sponsors, would require that those performing abortions at or beyond 20 weeks gestation provide the mother with certain information regarding the capacity of the unborn child to experience pain during the abortion and offer the mother the option of having pain-reducing drugs administered directly to the unborn child to reduce the baby's pain.

Mr. Speaker, before an abortion involving a pain-capable child begins, the abortionist would have to provide the woman with an oral statement at this stage of development of the unborn child, saying that the child has physical structures to feel pain and that the abortion would likely cause pain to the unborn child.

□ 2000

The bill ensures that the mother has the option of choosing to have anesthesia administered directly to the unborn child if she so desires in order to

reduce or to eliminate and mitigate that pain.

Mr. Speaker, the recent partial-birth abortion trials have shattered, hopefully forever, the myth, the big lie, that somehow the unborn child does not feel pain during an abortion. The pro-abortion lobby has spread that. Finally, that myth has been shattered. Even the American Civil Liberties Union, Mr. Speaker, the ACLU, has conceded that unborn children feel pain during an abortion. In a February motion to exclude evidence regarding fetal pain in the partial-birth abortion ban trials, the ACLU went so far as to argue that testimony on fetal pain in relation to partial-birth abortion was irrelevant because they said the dilation-and-evacuation method of abortion, involving dismemberment, is more painful than a partial-birth abortion.

So the question, Mr. Speaker, is clearly not whether or not unborn children feel pain during the commission of this act of violence, perfectly legal, a D&E, as they call it, method of abortion, but how much do the children feel. There is growing evidence, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that children feel a frightening amount of pain during these abortion procedures. I agree with the ACLU when they make that statement as they did before the court.

Let me just remind my colleagues, the D&E method of abortion as used in most second-trimester abortions involves the abortionist grasping the unborn child's body parts, various parts, arms, legs, torso with a long-toothed clamp. The fetal body parts are then torn off the body and pulled out of the mother piecemeal. It is an act of dismemberment. It is a despicable act. It is a violent act. It is an act of violence.

It takes about 30 minutes for this act of violence, again perfectly legal, allowed by Roe v. Wade, to occur. During those 30 minutes, this child suffers immensely. I would remind my colleagues that Congress requires that pain be mitigated when livestock are slaughtered, not so when an unborn child is slaughtered. I would ask Members to take a good, strong look at this legislation and hopefully cosponsor it and get this bill to the floor so that we can vote on it.

Let me just finally say to my colleagues, there was a Zogby poll recently on the question, do you support laws requiring that women who are 20 weeks or more along in their pregnancy be given information about fetal pain before having an abortion? Seventy-seven percent of the people said yes. Only 16 percent disagreed. We should not be killing these children, Mr. Speaker, but they should at least not have to suffer such excruciating pain. I urge passage as soon as possible of this legislation.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNES). 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 TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

---

## TIMKEN PLANT CLOSINGS ELIMINATE 1,300 OHIO JOBS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, April 24, 2003, President Bush came to Canton, Ohio, to address workers at the Timken Company, a company which makes ball bearings and other metal products. The President chose his visit to Timken to showcase his economic policy. During his speech, the President told Timken workers:

''Here at Timken last year, productivity rose 10 percent. Which means that America can compete with any nation in the world because we got the finest workers in the world.''

President Bush told the Timken workers that if his tax plans were enacted ''more than a million new jobs will be created by the end of 2004.'' He then went on to say, ''That's what the whole purpose of our economic package is, to create the conditions for job growth so people can find work.''

One million jobs created by 2004. He was so confident of this that he mentioned it twice during his speech. Last week the Timken management announced the company will close its Canton plant, eliminating 1,300 more Ohio manufacturing jobs. Third- and fourth-generation workers at this plant who helped build this company now face unemployment. Timken is closing its Canton plants, three of them, while building another facility in China.

Like a host of other predictions and promises delivered by President Bush, the record just has not matched the rhetoric. The Bush economic record of the last 4 years, ship jobs overseas, give tax cuts to large corporations, help corporations reap big profits, lay off American workers. It happened at Timken. It has happened at plant after plant after plant in my State and all over the country. In my State alone, we have lost one out of six manufacturing jobs since President Bush took office. One hundred eighty thousand manufacturing workers have lost their jobs. That comes out to about 200 Ohioans a day who have been thrown out of work since George Bush took his oath of office.

The recent modest job creation numbers are welcome that we are seeing in some places around the country but too many of those jobs are low-paid service jobs, too many of these jobs are seasonal work, too few of them have health and pension benefits. The men and women at Timken, the men and women who build things in America, want to know where they are going to find the good-paying jobs to send their kids to school, to feed their families and to pay their mortgages.

The Timken Corporation, however, is doing just fine. Three weeks before announcing the Canton plant closure, Timken boasted in a press release of its record quarterly sales of $1.1 billion for the first 3 months of this year. They also added that earnings per share were up 63 percent over earnings per share 1 year ago. In a speech to Timken workers, the President bragged that worker productivity, productivity of these workers for the previous year, was up 10 percent. So we have worker productivity up 10 percent, we have corporate profits going up significantly, we have sales setting records, yet Timken laid off hundreds of workers, 1,300 workers, and closed down three plants.

Last spring, the President when he visited Timken was also visiting Tim Timken, the chairman of this company. Mr. Timken is a Ranger, meaning he raised more than $200,000 for the Bush campaign in 2000. Mr. Timken also raised soon after that 2003 visit another $600,000 for an event for the 2004 campaign. In other words, President Bush's economic policies have worked just fine for Mr. Timken and his family but the Bush economic program has failed the families of 1,300 Timken workers.

We can do better for America's workers. First of all we can extend unemployment benefits to 1 million Americans in this country who have lost jobs, who are looking for work, who have not found work and whose benefits have expired. Fifty thousand of those workers live in Ohio. Second, Congress can pass the bipartisan Crane-Rangel bill which instead of rewarding those companies that go overseas and do their manufacturing as the Timken company is doing, instead of rewarding them we give tax breaks, we give tax incentives, we reward those companies that stay in the United States and manufacture. If 100 percent of your manufacturing is in the U.S., you get 100 percent of the benefits. If 10 percent of your manufacturing is in the U.S. and 90 percent is in China and Mexico and Indonesia, you only get 10 percent of the benefits. The third thing we need to do is quit using our Tax Code to send our jobs overseas. Too many workers have seen their tax dollars go to subsidize their companies who go overseas and cost American jobs. Something has got to change.

## 2004 COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON U.S. TRADE AND INVESTMENT POLICY TOWARD SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Consistent with title I of the Trade and Development Act of 2000, I am providing a report prepared by my Administration entitled ''2004 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy for Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.''

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 2004*.

## NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here for some time this evening listening to the discussion and I am struck by the tone. We have had speakers from both sides of the aisle rise to discuss different things. I notice that my colleagues from this side of the aisle have risen to celebrate an anniversary of World War II, to talk about an important economic and trade issue with the developing nation of India, to talk about the tragedy of the pain of unborn children and my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have taken every occasion with every speaker to make outrageous claims and to engage in vicious partisan attacks against the President of the United States and the Republican Party and it saddens me.

But tonight I wish to join my colleagues from this side of the aisle in a celebration. As we celebrate the anniversary of the landmark Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision this week, we have an excellent opportunity to recognize some of the vast improvements made in the quality of education available to America's children over the past 50 years.

In the Brown v. Board of Education case, the doctrine of ''separate but equal'' education for different groups of students was found to produce unequal results and was ruled unconstitutional. On this important anniversary, Mr. Speaker, we are working to ensure another group of students, our special needs children, receive the same high quality education available to every child in Minnesota and America.

Because no two students are the same and no two schools face identical challenges, one of the most important elements in any Federal education law is flexibility. I am pleased to share with my colleagues one of the many ways in which our committee, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, has worked with the Department of Education to enhance that flexibility for our schools. Following implementation of the No Child Left Behind education law, teachers and administrators expressed concern and many of them to me over the last year that special needs children were required to pass the same tests as their non-special needs counterparts. At the same time parents of special needs children expressed concern that exempting their children from testing altogether would eliminate the ability to monitor their progress. To address these competing concerns, the Department of Education issued a rule providing States and school districts with the flexibility to provide alternate tests to determine the adequate yearly progress for children with the most severe disabilities. Under the rule, alternate tests can be administered only to children with the most significant cognitive disabilities, only 1 percent of all students, or about 10 percent of students with disabilities. All other students with disabilities will take either the regular State assessments or assessments aligned with State standards designed to compensate for the child's disability.

Because it prohibits States and schools from excluding students with disabilities from accountability systems, the No Child Left Behind provides parents of these children with something they have never had before, the right to know whether their children are getting the education they deserve, what every parent wants.

I believe we are making great strides toward improving the quality of education available to every child in America. I remain committed to addressing the concerns of parents, teachers and administrators as we seek to not only maintain but to build on this quality. I look forward to continuing the fight to provide the necessary flexibility to accommodate those States and those schools who wish to participate.

Leaving no child behind means leaving no child behind, not ''no child except children with disabilities.'' On this important anniversary, Mr. Speaker, we are living up to that promise.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART 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 Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

(Mr. HINCHEY 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. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

## FALLEN HEROES

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to all of our fallen citizens who have lost their lives defending freedom in the war against terror.

I want to thank JIM WALSH and CHARLIE RANGEL for working together to come up with this tribute to those who have died defending freedom.

This Memorial Day, we all need to take an extra moment to remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice as we remember those who are separated from their families and fighting in distant lands to defend freedom.

I especially want to call attention to the sacrifices of two of my constituents who died in the service of their Nation: Staff Sgt. Jacob Frazier and Marine 1st Lt. Timothy Ryan.

Staff Sgt. Jacob Frazier, 24, of St. Charles Township, was killed in March 2003, when his patrol unit was ambushed in Afghanistan. Frazier joined the Illinois Air National Guard in 1998, a year after graduating from Central High School in Burlington. The oldest of James and Joyce Frazier's five children, he was a wrestler, all-conference football player and a member of the choir in high school. He was engaged to be married. Frazier was assigned to the 169th Air Support Operations Squadron of the 182nd Airlift Wing of the National Guard, and had been working with U.S. Army Special Forces in Afghanistan since January 2003. He was proud to serve his country, and often told friends and family ''I'm going to hunt bad guys,''—a reference to the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11.

Marine 1st Lt. Timothy Ryan, 30, of North Aurora, died in May 2003, when his helicopter crashed into a canal in Iraq. The son of Judith and Michael Ryan, Tim Ryan grew up with his older brother in Montgomery and Aurora, graduating from West Aurora High School. A music

major, he began playing the drums when he was in 4th grade and was a member of the marching band at West Aurora High. He attended Illinois State University, where he met his wife, Michelle. He graduated, was married, and enlisted in the Marines during a single month in 1997. Ryan joined the Marines to be a part of its drum and bugle corps, but changed course after two years because he wanted to be a pilot. He was stationed at Camp Pendleton, near San Diego, and deployed to Kuwait in February 2003.

May God bless these two men who died so that we could live in freedom. And may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I stood on the House floor on May 20, 2004, and observed a moment of silence to remember the brave men and women who fought and died for our freedom. During this time, images flashed in my mind of the heroic Kansans I visited at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the men and women I spoke with when I traveled to Iraq in January. These images culminated into a feeling of pride, a feeling I know each and every American feels when they think of what America means to them.

As a Nation on Memorial Day we honor the men and women who through the history of our country gave their lives in battle to defend the freedom and liberty that makes these American States united. From the Revolutionary War to Operation Iraqi Freedom, we honor these brave souls in unison as one people on this day. The Memorial Day weekend has also come to symbolize a time for family and friends to come together; during this time it becomes abundantly clear who is missing. Please join me in thanking these families for their sacrifice as well.

In times of crisis, our Nation looks to the men and women of the armed forces. They have never hesitated in answering their Nation's call, giving of their time, service and in many cases their lives. Our Nation owes them a debt that we can never repay. The dedication and valor displayed by those who served in the armed services deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation.

As the number of veterans growing older increases, the responsibility of providing adequate care and compensation to their families will become a higher priority for the Federal Government.

After making a sacrifice for our country, our veterans should not have to be concerned that the Veterans Administration will not provide the services or benefits they have earned.

As a veteran myself, it saddens me to see how some of our Nation's finest citizens are being treated. We owe it to all of our veterans—whether they fought on the front lines or served here at home—to keep the promise America made to them. Veterans should not be financially punished in the name of fiscal responsibility. Even in difficult budget times, there is no excuse for cutting already underfunded veterans' programs to pay for tax cuts.

I will continue to urge my colleagues in Congress to rethink these cuts. We must work together from both sides of the aisle to ensure that these cuts are restored to honor our nation's commitment to care for its defenders. I will fight to see that Congress makes adequate funding for the Veterans Administration a priority—not an afterthought.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of our military personnel who have made the ultimate sacrifice and lost their lives in service to their country. To the families and friends of these fallen soldiers, I offer my condolences in their time of grief. Please know that we all share in your sorrow.

I would like to recognize the soldiers from the Sacramento area who have lost their lives while serving their country. SP Keicia Coleman Hines, of Sacramento, was a member of the 108th Military Police Combat Support Company when she died while serving on a base near Mosul in Iraq. She was her mother Beverly Coleman's only child. Ms. Coleman has said she is extremely proud of her daughter, and that she was an honorable person. I share Ms. Coleman's pride in her daughter and in the work she chose to do. Keicia is also survived by her husband, who she met at basic training. They had planned to start their own family when Keicia returned from Iraq. She was 27 years old.

SP Adam G. Kinser, was assigned to the 304th Psychological Operations Company, United States Army Reserve, and serving in Afghanistan when he died of injuries from the explosion of a weapons cache. He had a soft spot in his heart for the children of Iraq, and would often ask friends and family to send crayons and coloring books for the kids. At the time of his death, he was just one month away from being sent home to be with his wife, who was about to have their first child. His family lives in Sacramento and Rio Vista.

U.S. Army MAJ Gerald Compton, son of MSG Gerald Compton, U.S. Army, retired, and Sue Joe Compton of Sacramento, was training cadets at West Point when he passed away of natural causes. Major Compton had dedicated his life to the Army and passed on his sense of dedication to the cadets he trained. His cadets and colleagues will remember Major Compton as a skilled officer, a leader and friend to all who knew him.

Words cannot begin to express our gratitude to these brave soldiers. Nor can words describe the debt we owe their families. Instead, today we honor the soldiers and their families through a moment of silence. Our thoughts and prayers are with all those who bear this burden.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise with my colleagues today to observe a moment of silence in honor of our fallen soldiers, including the nearly 800 U.S. troops who gave their lives in Iraq.

As Memorial Day approaches, we pause to honor each of the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who gave their lives to defend our freedom. We will always remember their valor and sacrifices for America. We also pause to mourn with their families and friends who go on without their loved ones.

Today, more than 135,000 brave men and women remain in harm's way. Our continued attention should be focused on our troops, the success of their mission, and their safe return to their families.

I was proud to cast my vote for the defense authorization bill earlier today as a measure that honors their service and delivers much-needed relief. This legislation meets immediate warfighting needs, expands quality of life initiatives, and makes up for readiness shortfalls.

I am pleased to support a much deserved 3.5 percent pay raise for our troops, hardship duty pay increases, and a restored Survivors Benefit. I also strongly support the bill's increased production for armored Humvees and body armor as well as improvements to family housing, military medical facilities and schools.

I salute the brave men and women in uniform who will become our Nation's newest veterans upon their return. Now that over 14 months have passed since U.S. troops were deployed to Iraq, we wish them all a safe return and will work to ensure they have all the resources they need to accomplish the mission and bring them home safely to their families.

Mr. Speaker, our fallen troops will always remain in our thoughts and prayers. We will remember their sacrifices this Memorial Day and beyond, and we will do all that we can to support our troops currently deployed and to ensure their safe return.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, across this great Nation, Americans designate the last Monday in May to honor those who have fallen in battle protecting our freedom. Memorial Day this year is especially important as we are reminded almost daily of the great sacrifices that the men and women of the Armed Services make to defend our way of life. Those who served, and those who continue to serve in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard took an oath to uphold and protect the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic, and we can never forget the importance of their commitment to our Nation.

North Carolina, particularly the 8th District, has long played a key role in our Nation's military forces. Troops from Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base are nobly answering the call of duty, separated from their families, friends, and loved ones. Currently serving alongside the active component in Iraq is the North Carolina National Guard. These individuals who put their lives on hold to answer the call of duty are the pinnacle of American patriotism. To prosecute the war on terrorism, the State of North Carolina has deployed 3,500 guardsmen, the largest deployment in the State's history. While putting themselves in harms' way, the men and women in uniform, whether part of the active or reserve component, seek to root out the evil that seeks America's destruction. Their mission is clear and they will succeed. I cannot express how proud I am of them and the entire military for their service, selfless attitude and sacrifice.

Of all the recent publicity the war on terrorism has garnered, sometimes overlooked is the support of our troops by their valiant spouses and families. The support they provide and the hardship that they are enduring are to be recognized and commended. Without such support in place, our troops would not be as ready or prepared to fight the battle.

While we continue to pray for those who are deployed and their families, we must hold a special place in our hearts for their fallen comrades. The men and women who have paid the ultimate sacrifice safeguarding our great Nation must be honored and remembered. Freedom is not free, and many have given all they have—their lives—for its and our defense. May we as a Nation be eternally grateful for their sacrifice and remember their families in our prayers. May God bless the families of our fallen heroes, watch over their families, and may He bless and protect those who continue to serve. May God bless our U.S. Armed Forces and the United States of America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of our troops. I rise in support of all of our men and women serving in our armed forces, and especially the 300,000 brave men and women that have been serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

To our young countrymen and women serving their country in Afghanistan and Iraq, I salute you and I offer you the following:

As our Nation once again honors those who have served, I pray that this Memorial Day finds you healthy and well.

Some of you may know that, although, I supported our action against al Qaeda in Afghanistan, I voted against President Bush's demand for advance congressional authorization to use military force against Iraq.

In the absence of a clearly demonstrated imminent danger to this Nation, I concluded, giving the President a ''blank check'' for war would be an abdication of my constitutional duty as a Member of the Congress. Further, I believed it would put our young men and women into a conflict that would yield enduring unfavorable outcomes. Once Saddam Hussein was toppled, for what and with whom would we be fighting? Where is the proof of WMDs or the presence of al Qaeda in Iraq? These were just a few of the many questions I and many Members of Congress wanted to ask. But in the administration's rush to war and its subsequent insolence, these and many questions remain unanswered.

Today, my reasoning for that conviction remains unchanged. There is not today—nor has there ever been any dispositive proof that Iraq is an imminent danger to our country. Like the majority of the international community, I believe ''imminent danger'' is the proper litmus test for waging a preemptive war. The current administration does not and ignored warnings from many countries who were friends in our fight against terrorism. I ask the Commander-in-Chief, who suffers and will continue to suffer as a result of this affront to the international rules of engagement? The answer is that we all do, but it is our troops who bear the blunt of this suffering.

There has been a tragic loss of life—both among our American troops and among Iraq's civilian population. I knew the human losses would be too great and I did not want our families—or the Iraqi people—to experience the overwhelming grief and remorse that accompanies waging war unnecessarily.

The moral authority of the United States has been undermined—establishing a devastating international precedent that we may well see echoed within other troubled regions. I believe that the Middle East region has been destabilized, harming the international cooperation that we desperately need to defend this Nation against terrorism.

We must now contemplate the prospect of American troops remaining in Iraq for an indefinite period of time, at great cost to the lives and treasure of our Nation, while its government regroups a country that has been involuntarily bowed.

Tragically, none of these cautions about war prevailed, and hundreds of thousands of young Americans now struggle to survive in harm's way.

With so many questions about the wisdom and consequences of this war left unanswered, what can America say to you—the young men and women who have been called upon to risk your lives?

What can we say to your wives and husbands—or to your parents and children—that could possibly justify your sacrifice?

The current administration that waged this war must search for his own answers to these soul-wrenching questions—and I must speak to you in my own way.

Young people, I hope that these words reach you in Iraq.

You have a right to expect encouragement and support at this difficult and dangerous time. I encourage you and commend you for your bravery. I know you are dealing with circumstances beyond our comprehension.

Nevertheless, you stand at the brink of eternity—and you deserve an honest appraisal. You are doing your duty, just as we in the Congress must do everything within our power to protect you.

So, I will continue to call for clear and convincing evidence that war was necessary and I will continue to support the Federal funding that has helped to make you the best trained and equipped military force in the world. You deserve nothing less.

Human life is too precious to allow anything less.

I am among those whom the administration has not convinced about the wisdom of war in Iraq. Yet, I want you to know that I support you wholeheartedly. You are there to protect and defend and you are serving and have served valiantly.

You are honorable young Americans.

When the President committed your lives to battle, you went to war with your Nation's prayers and unconditional support. I pledge that we will not allow this Nation's response to your service degenerate into the shameful neglect that followed U.S. efforts in Vietnam. We will not blame the failures of our generation upon yours.

Indeed, you have my undying respect.

Neither President Bush nor I have ever been required to risk our own lives in battle. We have not been forced to move forward against the mechanized hell of modern warfare. We have not endured the screams of tormented friends who have fallen at our side.

War leaders of old did not direct war from the safety of their homes. There was great wisdom in the ancient custom that required a leader who ordered others into battle to, himself, fight on the front lines. The danger is not real when it's second-hand.

You are honorable young Americans—you are our young women and men who now stand at the brink of eternity. Over 700 of your brethren and of the Allied Forces have perished. Over 4,500 of you have been injured or maimed. At least 10 claim Maryland as their home State and I have attached their names in memoriam and in recognition of their brave service to our country.

May those who lead America today regain wisdom and bring the rest of you home safely. May our actions from this day forward live up to the example of your sacrifice.

And may God bless you and keep you in His hands.

In Memoriam and in recognition of brave service to our Country—Operation Iraqi Freedom: Jakia Sheree Cannon, Brandon Lee Davis, Jason Christopher Ford, Cornell Winston Gilmore I, Jason David Mileo, George Arthur Mitchell, Jr., Adam Garber Mooney, Bryan Nicholas Spry, Jeffery Calvin Walker, Kendall Damon Waters-Bey.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that the U.S. House of Representatives holds this moment of silence on behalf of our fallen warriors in Iraq and Afghanistan. On the last legislative day before America observes Memorial Day, it is appropriate for us to pause from our business to pay our respects to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in those important and difficult theatres of war.

As the Representative of North Carolina's Second Congressional District, I have the honor of serving the military families of the Army's Fort Bragg, Pope Air Force Base, and numerous National Guard and Reserve units. I have observed our troops training for combat, and I have visited soldiers wounded in the battlefield in their recovery at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, DC.

Last month, I had the opportunity to travel to Iraq to witness firsthand the daily struggle our soldiers wage in that war-torn country. The work they are doing is vitally important to bring peace and stability in Iraq and allow for the growth of a just and open democracy in a place that has never really known such conditions that we take for granted. Previously, I visited Afghanistan to investigate our progress in taking the war against terrorism into the sanctuary of the terrorists. Our troops are dedicated, professional and motivated by their love of America and the folks back home who pray for their safety and their speedy return.

Mr. Speaker, this moment of silence on behalf of our fallen heroes is an important opportunity to state once and for all that the American people and the Congress of the United States strongly support our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our soldiers who have died in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As of May 19, 2004, 783 American men and women had lost their lives as a part of Operation Iraqi Freedom and 123 American men and women had lost their lives as a part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

I am forever indebted to these courageous men and women because the fight for freedom is not without loss.

I fully support the military families of these heroes who have sacrificed their lives in the service of our country.

In my State of Texas, we have lost 84 men and women defending America's dream of democracy and freedom for all.

I am sure all Texans join me in letting their families know that we consider all of them heroes because they died answering the call of our country.

It is because of them we enjoy our freedom and live in the greatest country there is.

Father Dennis Edward O'Brien of the USMC wrote the following poem honoring our soldiers:

It is the soldier, not the reporter,
Who has given us freedom of the press.

It is the soldier, not the poet,
Who has given us the freedom of speech.

It is the soldier, not the campus organizer,
Who has given us the freedom to demonstrate.

It is the soldier
Who salutes the flag,
Who serves beneath the flag
And whose coffin is draped by the flag.
Who allows the protester to burn the flag.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the fallen Texas soldiers be printed in the RECORD. May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn and God bless America.

TEXAS FALLEN HEROES

OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

Marine Cpl. Daniel R. Amaya died from hostile fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Force, Twentynine Palms, California. Died on April 11, 2004.

Army Spc. Edward J. Anguiano, 24, of Brownsville, Texas. Spc. Anguiano was in a six-vehicle convoy on Highway 7 in Iraq when enemy forces ambushed them on March 23. His remains were recovered on April 24. Anguiano was assigned to 3rd Forward Support Battalion, Fort Stewart, Georgia.

Marine CWO Andrew Todd Arnold, 30, of Spring, Texas. Killed in a non-hostile accident with two other soldiers when a rocket-propelled grenade launcher they were firing for familiarization malfunctioned on a firing range near the city of Al Kut, Iraq. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 10th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Brigade, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Died on April 22, 2003.

Army Spc. Richard Arriaga, 20, of Ganado, Texas. Arriaga was killed in an ambush by small arms fire and rocket propelled grenade in Tikrit, Iraq. He was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 4th Battalion, 42nd Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on September 18, 2003.

Army Spc. Robert R. Arsiaga, 25, of San Antonio, Texas. Arsiaga died in Baghdad, Iraq, when his unit was attacked with rocket-propelled grenades and small arms fire. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 4, 2004.

Marine Lance Cpl. Aaron C. Austin, 21, of Sunray, Texas. Austin died due to hostile fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 26, 2004.

Marine Pfc. Chad E. Bales, 20, of Coahoma, Texas. Killed in a non-hostile vehicle accident during convoy operations east of Ash Shahin, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Transportation Support Battalion, 1st Force Service Support Group, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 3, 2003.

Army Sgt. Michael Paul Barrera, 26, of Von Ormy, Texas. Barrea was fatally injured when his tank was hit with an improvised explosive device in Baqubah, Iraq. Barrera was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 67th Armor Regiment, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on October 28, 2003.

Army Capt. Ernesto M. Blanco, 28, of Texas. Blanco was conducting a support mission when an improvised explosive device hit his vehicle in Qaryat Ash Shababi, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Died on December 28, 2003.

Army CW4 Clarence E. Boone, 50, of Fort Worth Texas. Boone died as a result of a non-combat related injury in Kuwait City, Kuwait. He was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on December 2, 2003.

Army Spc. Philip D. Brown, 21, of El Paso, Texas. Brown died in Balad, Iraq, from injuries sustained by an improvised explosive device west of Samarra. He was assigned to the Army National Guard's Company B, 141st Engineer Combat Battalion, Jamestown, North Dakota. Died on May 8, 2004.

Army Spc. Adolfo C. Carballo, 20, of Houston, Texas. Carballo died in Baghdad, Iraq, when shrapnel struck him. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 21st Field Artillery Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 10, 2004.

Marine Lance Cpl. James A. Casper, 20, of Coolidge, Texas. Casper died due to a non-combat related incident at Al Asad, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 11th Marines, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on March 25, 2004.

Army Staff Sgt. Roland L. Castro, 26, of San Antonio, Texas. Castro died of a non-hostile gunshot wound in Camp Cedar II, Iraq. He was assigned to Battery A, 1st Battalion, 12th Field Artillery, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Died on January 16, 2004.

Army Staff Sgt. Gary L. Collins, 32, of Hardin, Texas. Collins was riding in a Bradley Fighting Vehicle when it hit an improvised explosive device in Fallujah, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 16th Infantry Regiment, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on November 8, 2003.

Army Spc. Zeferino E. Colunga, 20, of Bellville, Texas. Colunga was initially evacuated to the 28th Combat Support Hospital in Iraq on Aug. 4. He was then evacuated to Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and later to Homburg University Hospital in Germany for further evaluation. He remained at Homburg until his death. His death was unrelated to the recent cases of pneumonia in Southwest Asia. Colunga was assigned to 4th Squadron, 2nd Armored Calvary Regiment, Fort Polk, Louisiana. Died on August 6, 2003.

Army Pfc. Rey D. Cuervo, 24, of Laguna Vista, Texas. Cuervo was on a mounted patrol in Baghdad, Iraq when an improvised explosive device hit his vehicle. He was assigned to 1st Squadron, 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Polk, Louisiana. Died on December 28, 2003.

Air Force Capt. Eric B. Das, 30, of Amarillo, Texas. Das was the pilot of an F–15E that went down during a combat mission in Iraq. He was assigned to the 333rd Fighter Squadron, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina. Died on April 7, 2003.

Army Pfc. Ervin Dervishi, 21, of Fort Worth, Texas. Dervishi died in Baji, Iraq, during a combat patrol when a rocket-propelled grenade hit the Bradley Fighting Vehicle in which he was traveling. He was evacuated to the 28th Combat Support Hospital where he later died. Dervishi was assigned to Company B, 1st Battalion, 22nd Infantry Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on January 24, 2004.

Army Staff Sgt. Joe L. Dunigan, Jr., 37, of Belton, Texas. Dunigan died in Fallujah, Iraq, when his vehicle was hit by an improvised explosive device. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 16th Infantry Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on March 11, 2004.

Army Sgt. William C. Eckhart, 25, of Rocksprings, Texas. Eckhart died in Baqubah, Iraq when he was on an anti-mortar mission and there was an explosion of unknown origin. He was assigned to 4th Cavalry, 1st Infantry Division, Schweinfurt, Germany. Died on April 10, 2004.

Army Pfc. Analaura Esparza-Gutierrez, 21, of Houston, Texas. Esparza-Gutierrez was in a convoy that was hit by an improvised explosive device and rocket propelled grenades in Tikrit, Iraq. Esparza-Gutierrez died of her injuries. She was assigned to A Company, 4th Forward Support Battalion, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on October 1, 2003.

Army Pvt. Ruben Estrella-Soto, 18, of El Paso, Texas. Killed in action after his convoy was ambushed in Iraq on March 23. He was assigned to the 507th Maintenance Company, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Army Master Sgt. George A. Fernandez, 36, of El Paso, Texas. Killed in action in northern Iraq. He was assigned to Headquarters, U.S. Army Special Operations Command, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Died on April12, 2003.

Army Chief Warrant Officer Wesley C. Fortenberry, 38, of Woodville, Texas. Fortenberry died in Baghdad, Iraq when his helicopter was shot down. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 227th Aviation Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 11, 2004.

Army Pvt. Robert L. Frantz, 19, of San Antonio, Texas. Frantz was on guard duty when a local resident threw a grenade over the wall. Frantz died of his injuries in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to Company B, 1st Battalion, 36th Infantry Regiment, 1st Armored Division, Ray Barracks, Germany. Died on June 17, 2003.

Army Spc. Israel Garza, 25, of Lubbock, Texas. Garza died in Baghdad, Iraq, when his unit was attacked with rocket-propelled grenades and small arms fire. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 4, 2004.

Army 1st Sgt. Joe J. Garza, 43, of Robstown, Texas. Garza was riding in a HMMWV that swerved to avoid a civilian vehicle in Baghdad, Iraq. Graza fell out and was struck by a civilian vehicle. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, Fort Benning, Georgia. Died on April 28, 2003.

Marine Lance Cpl. Shane L. Goldman, 20, of Orange, Texas. Goldman died due to injuries received from hostile fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 5, 2004.

Marine Cpl. Jeffrey G. Green, 20, of Dallas, Texas. Green was found deceased on May 5, 2004 in the Euphrates River, in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. Cause of death is under investigation. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California.

Army Pfc. Clayton W. Henson, 20, of Stanton, Texas. Henson died when his convoy was ambushed in Dwaniyan, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Squadron, 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Polk, Louisiana. Died on April 17, 2004.

Army Master Sgt. Kelly L. Hornbeck, 36, of Fort Worth, Texas. Hornbeck sustained injuries on January 16 when an improvised explosive device hit his vehicle, south of Samarra, Iraq. He was initially evacuated to the 21st Combat Support Hospital and then moved to the 28th CSH for further treatment where he later died. Hornbeck was assigned to Company C, 3rd Battalion, 10th Special Forces Group, Fort Carson, Colorado. Died on January 18, 2004.

Army 1st Lt. Doyle M. Hufstedler, 25, of Abilene, Texas. Hufstedler died in Habbaniyah, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device hit his armored personnel carrier. He was assigned to the Army's 1st Engineer Battalion, 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on March 31, 2004.

Army Spc. Ray J. Hutchinson, 20, of League City, Texas. Hutchinson was returning from a patrol when an improvised explosive device hit his vehicle in Mosul, Iraq. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky. Died on December 7, 2003.

Army CW2 Scott Jamar, 32, of Sweetwater, Texas. Killed when his UH–60 Black Hawk helicopter crashed in central Iraq. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Aviation Regiment, Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia. Died on April 2, 2003.

Army Spc. John P. Johnson, 24, of Houston, Texas. Johnson died of non-combat related injuries in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 1st Armored Division, Baumholder, Germany. Died on October 22, 2003.

Army Spc. Michael G. Karr, Jr., 23, of San Antonio, Texas. Karr died in Habbaniyah, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device hit his armored personnel carrier. He was assigned to the Army's 1st Engineer Battalion, 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on March 31, 2004.

Marine Cpl. Brian Matthew Kennedy, 25, of Houston, Texas. Killed in a CH–46E helicopter crash in Kuwait. He was assigned to the Marine Medium Helicopter Squadron—268, 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing, Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on March 20, 2003.

Army Spc. James M. Kiehl, 22, of Comfort, Texas. Killed in action after his convoy was ambushed in Iraq on March 23. He was assigned to the 507th Maintenance Company, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Army Spc. Scott Q. Larson, Jr., 22, of Houston, Texas. Larson died in Baghdad, Iraq, of injuries sustained when his convoy was ambushed. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 37th Armor Regiment, 1st Brigade, 1st Armor Division, Ray Barracks, Friedberg, Germany. Died on April 5, 2004.

Army Staff Sgt. Rene Ledesma, 34, of Abelene, Texas. Ledesma died in Baghdad, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device exploded near his Bradley Fighting Vehicle. He was assigned to 1st Squadron, 7th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on May 15, 2004.

Army Pfc. Jason C. Ludlam, 22, of Arlington, Texas. Ludlam died in Ba'qubah, Iraq, when he was electrocuted while laying telephone wires. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 2nd Infantry Regiment, 1st Infantry Division, based in Vilseck, Germany. Died on March 19, 2004.

Army Chief Warrant Officer Johnny Villareal Mata, 35, of Pecos, Texas. Killed in action after his convoy was ambushed in Iraq on March 23. He was assigned to the 507th Maintenance Company, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Marine Cpl. Matthew E. Matula, 20, of Spicewood, Texas. Matula died from hostile fire in Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 1st Marines, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 9, 2004.

Marine Cpl. Jesus Martin Antonio Medellin, 21, of Fort Worth, Texas. Killed in Central Iraq when an enemy artillery round struck the Amphibious Assault Vehicle in which he was riding. He was assigned to the 3rd Assault Amphibian Battalion, 1st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 7, 2003.

Army Sgt. Daniel K. Methvin, 22, of Belton, Texas. Methvin was killed as a result of a grenade being thrown from a window of an Iraqi civilian hospital that he was guarding in Ba'qubah, Iraq. He was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 67th Armor Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on July 26, 2003.

Army Pfc. Anthony S. Miller, 19, of San Antonio, Texas. Killed by enemy indirect fire in Iraq. He was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3rd Infantry Division, 2nd Brigade, Fort Stewart, Georgia. Died on April 7, 2003.

Army Pfc. Stuart W. Moore, 21, of Livingston, Texas. Moore died in Baghdad, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device struck his convoy. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 3rd Field Artillery Regiment, 1st Armored Division, based in Giessen, Germany. Died on December 22, 2003.

Army Sgt. Gerardo Moreno, 23, of Terrell, Texas. Moreno died in Ashula, Iraq, when his unit was ambushed by individuals who fired a rocket-propelled grenade. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 6, 2004.

Marine Pfc. Ricky A. Morris, Jr., 20, of Lubbock, Texas. Morris died as a result of enemy action in Al Qaim, Iraq. He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twentynine Palms, California. Died on March 18, 2004.

Army Sgt. Keelan L. Moss, 23, of Houston, Texas. Moss was on board a CH–47 Chinook Helicopter when it went down in Al Fallujah, Iraq. The cause of the incident is unknown and an investigation is underway. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 5th Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Died on November 2, 2003.

Army Spc. Joseph C. Norquist, 26, of San Antonio, Texas. Norquist was in a convoy that came under attack from rocket propelled grenades and small arms fire in Baqubah, Iraq. Norquist was fatally injured in the incident. He was assigned to the 588th Engineer Battalion, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on October 9, 2003.

Army Capt. Eric T. Paliwoda, 28, of Texas. Paliwoda was in his command post in Balad, Iraq when it came under mortar attack. He was assigned to 4th Engineer Battalion, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division (Mechanized), Fort Carson, Colorado. Died on January 2, 2004.

Army Pfc. James D. Parker, 20, of Bryan, Texas. Parker died in a mortar attack on a forward operating base near Ba'qubah. He was assigned to the 588th Engineer Battalion (Heavy), 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on January 21, 2004.

Army Staff Sgt. Hector R. Perez, 40, of Corpus Christi, Texas. Killed north of Al Hawd, Iraq, when his military convoy came under enemy fire. Perez was assigned to Company A, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry, 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, Kentucky. Died on July 24, 2003.

Army Spc. Jose A. Perez III, 22, of San Diego, Texas. Perez was in a convoy that was ambushed in Taji, Iraq. He was assigned to 6th Battalion, 27th Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Died on May 28, 2003.

Army Spc. Larry E. Polley, Jr., 20, of Center, Texas. Polley was killed when his Bradley Fighting Vehicle struck an improvised explosive device and overturned north of Taji, Iraq. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 20th Field Artillery Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on January 17, 2004.

Army Sgt. Christopher Ramirez, 34, of McAllen, Texas. Ramirez died in Al Anbar Province, Iraq, from injuries sustained during combat operations. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 16th Infantry, 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on April 14, 2004.

Army Sgt. Ariel Rico, 25, of El Paso, Texas. Rico died of injuries sustained during an enemy mortar attack in Mosul, Iraq. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 320th Field Artillery Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky. Died on November 28, 2003.

Army 1st Lt. Jonathan D. Rozier, 25, of Katy, Texas. Rozier's unit was fired upon by rocket-propelled grenades and small arms fire while manning a vehicle checkpoint in Baghdad, Iraq. Rozier was assigned to B Company, 2–70th Armor Battalion (1st Armored Division), Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on July 19, 2003.

Army Spc. Isela Rubalcava, 25, of El Paso, Texas. Rubalcava died in Mosul, Iraq, when a mortar round hit near her. She was assigned to the 296th Combat Support Battalion, 3rd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division (Stryker Brigade Combat Team), Fort Lewis, Washington. Died on May 8, 2004.

Army Sgt. John W. Russell, 26, of Portland, Texas. Russell died when two 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) UH–60 Black Hawk helicopters crashed in Mosul, Iraq. He was assigned to the 4th Battalion, 101st Aviation Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky. Died on November 15, 2003.

Marine Pfc. Leroy Sandoval, Jr., 21, of Houston, Texas. Sandoval died due to hostile fire in the Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on March 26, 2004.

Army Spc. Christian C. Schulz, 20, of Colleyville, Texas. Schulz died as a result of non-combat injuries in Baqubah, Iraq. Schulz was assigned to the 3rd Troop, 67th Armor Battalion, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on July 11, 2003.

Marine Pfc. Dustin M. Sekula, 18, of Edinburg, Texas. Sekula died due to injuries sustained from enemy fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twentynine Palms, California. Died on April 1, 2004.

Army Pfc. Armando Soriano, 20, of Houston, Texas. Soriano was traveling in a two-vehicle convoy on a supply route when weather conditions caused his vehicle to slide off the road and roll over. He died as a result of his injuries in Haditha, Iraq. Soriano was assigned to the howitzer battery, 3rd Squadron, 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Carson, Colorado. The unit is currently attached to the 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Died on February 1, 2004.

Army Cpl. Tomas Sotelo, Jr., 20, of Houston, Texas. Sotelo was traveling in a convoy when a rocket propelled grenade struck his vehicle in Baghdad, Iraq. Sotelo was assigned to Headquarters Troop, 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Polk, Louisiana. Died on June 27, 2003.

Army Spc. Joseph D. Suell, 24, of Lufkin, Texas. Suell died from a non-combat related cause in Todjie, Iraq. Suell was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters and Service Battery, 5th Battalion, 3rd Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Died on June 16, 2003.

Marine Lance Cpl. Elias Torrez III, 21, of Veribest, Texas. Torrez died from hostile fire in Iraq. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twentynine Palms, California. Died on April 9, 2004.

Marine Lance Cpl. Ruben Valdez, Jr., 21, of San Diego, Texas. Valdez died due to injuries received from enemy action in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twentynine Palms, California. Died on April 17, 2004.

Army Sgt. Melissa Valles, 26, of Eagle Pass, Texas. Valles died in Balad, Iraq as a result of non-combat injuries. She was assigned to B Company, 64th Forward Support Battalion, Fort Carson, Colorado. Died on July 9, 2003.

Marine Lance Cpl. Michael B. Wafford, 20, of Spring, Texas. Wafford died due to injuries received from hostile fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 8, 2004.

Navy Lt. Nathan D. White, 30, of Abilene, Texas. Killed in action. White was the pilot of an F/A–18C Hornet lost over Iraq. He was assigned to Strike Fighter Squadron One Nine Five (VFA 195), based in Atsugi, Japan,

and currently deployed with Carrier Air Wing Five (CVW 5) aboard USS Kitty Hawk (CV 63). Died on April 2, 2003.

Army Sgt. Steven W. White, 29, of Fruitvale, Texas. White died of injuries sustained when his M113 armored personnel carrier hit an antitank mine in Tikrit, Iraq. White was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 4th Battalion, 42nd Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on August 13, 2003.

Army Spc. James C. Wright, 27, of Morgan, Texas. Wright was killed in an ambush by small arms fire and rocket propelled grenade in Tikrit, Iraq. He was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 4th Battalion, 42nd Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on September 18, 2003.

Army Pfc. Stephen E. Wyatt, 19, of Kilgore, Texas. Wyatt was in a convoy that was hit by an improvised explosive device and small arms fire in Balad, Iraq. Wyatt was assigned to C Battery, 1st Battalion, 17th Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Died on October 13, 2003.

Army Staff Sgt. Henry Ybarra III, 32, of Austin, Texas. Ybarra was changing the tire on a Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Truck in Balad, Iraq when the tire exploded. Ybarra died of his injuries. Ybarra was assigned to D Troop, 6th Squadron, 6th Cavalry, Illesheim, Germany. Died on September 11, 2003.

OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

Air Force Tech. Sgt. John A. Chapman, 36, of Waco, Texas. Killed in action in eastern Afghanistan during Operation Anaconda. Died on March 4, 2002.

Army Sgt. 1st Class Nathan R. Chapman, 31, of San Antonio, Texas. Died in Afghanistan. Died on January 4, 2002.

Army Staff Sgt. Brian T. Craig, 27, of Texas. Craig died as the result of an explosion during explosive clearing operations in Qandahar, Afghanistan. He was assigned to 710th Explosive Ordnance Detachment, San Diego, California. Died on April 15, 2002.

Army Spc. Rodrigo Gonzalez-Garza, 26, of Texas. Died in Kuwait. Died on February 24, 2003.

Air Force Airman 1st Class Raymond Losano, 24, of Del Rio, Texas. Losano was a tactical air command and control specialist assigned to the 14th Air Support Operation Squadron, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina. Died on April 25, 2003.

Army Sgt. 1st Class John E. Taylor, 31, of Wichita Falls, Texas. Taylor suffered a heart attack after completing physical training in Kabul, Afghanistan. Taylor was assigned to 1st Battalion, 3rd Special Forces Group, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Died on May 17, 2003.

Air Force Staff Sgt. John Teal, 29, of Dallas, Texas. Teal died in an HH–60 Pave Hawk accident in Afghanistan. He was assigned to the 41st Rescue Squadron, Moody Air Force Base, Georgia. Died on March 23, 2003.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, at the close of business this week, we will journey back home to our districts. There, we will meet with our constituents and hear their concerns so that we may better serve them. We will also celebrate Memorial Day with them. Memorial Day is a very special day for me and my family, as I am sure it is for millions of other families across our great nation.

Prior to my years in public office, I proudly served my country in the United States Army. During my twenty years as a soldier, I served a number of overseas tours, including two tours in Vietnam. The years I spent wearing the uniform of my country will always be special to me, and the brave Americans I knew as a result of my service will always have a special place in my heart.

I would like to take this opportunity today to reflect upon the sacrifices our brave servicemen and women have made in the past and are making today as they honorably serve overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know what it is like to serve in a hostile environment far away from the comforts of home, separated from your loved ones. I also know the joy they will feel when they return home to their families. However, war does not promise that everyone who serves will return home. War does not promise that families will see their brave soldiers again.

This Memorial Day, Iowans will join together with the rest of the nation as we honor those soldiers who gave the ultimate sacrifice to defend the United States, uphold our Constitution, and advance the cause of freedom around the world. We will honor GySgt. Jeffrey Bohr, Lance Cpl. Ben Carman, Pvt. Michael Deutsch, PO Trace Dossett, Sgt. Paul Fisher, Pvt. Kurt Frosheiser, Pfc. David Kirchhoff, Spc. Joshua Knowles, Sgt. Bradley Korthaus, Pvt. Kenneth Nalley, Spc. Aaron Sissel, CW4 Bruce Smith, Cpl. Michael R. Speer, and Pfc. Brandon Sturdy, brave Iowans who lost their lives serving in Iraq. I thank them for their sacrifice, and I, along with the rest of our nation, offer my deepest condolences to their families.

God bless our brave and honorable servicemen and women and their families. Your sacrifices will never be forgotten.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker. From the troops still in the field today in the deserts of Iraq and mountains of Afghanistan, to the scores of veterans who have served in different theaters and eras, Memorial Day is a time to honor these American heroes and celebrate the freedoms that their sacrifices have secured.

This Memorial Day we stand victorious in liberating Iraq and Afghanistan, and our soldiers have struck another blow against international terrorism. These patriots and their families are making great sacrifices on behalf of this nation, this world and all of humanity.

This is also a time for our nation to remember the high price of freedom, as we mourn with the families whose loved ones do not return from the front lines. Memorial Day is a time to honor their lives and their sacrifice.

New Mexico has been reminded that freedom isn't free, as we have laid to rest four of our bravest sons and daughters.

Air Force 1st Lt. Tamara Archuleta, 23 years old, of Los Lunas, New Mexico died on March 23, 2003 in an HH–60 Pave Hawk accident in Afghanistan. She was assigned to the 41st Rescue Squadron, Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Army Sgt. Lee D. Todacheene, 29 years old from Farmington, New Mexico, was killed April 6, 2004 when mortar fire hit his guard post in Balad, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 77th Armored Regiment, 1st Infantry Division, Germany

Marine Corp Pfc. Christopher Ramos, 26 years old from Albuquerque, New Mexico, was killed April 5, 2004 by hostile fire in Anbar province, Iraq. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Marine Lance Corporal Aaron Austin, 21 years old from Lovington, NM. He was killed April 26, 2004 by hostile fire in Anbar province, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, at Camp Pendleton, CA.

I ask for a Moment of Silence from this Body, to honor them, and their memory.

Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is May 31st this year. But each day we live in freedom is a Memorial Day, and an opportunity to thank our brave members of the United States Military, as well as our Veterans. They have the eternal thanks for a grateful nation.

The time we spend with our families and friends over Memorial Day weekend is a time for us to turn back toward what is truly important: our faith, our families, and our precious freedom.

May God Continue to Bless America.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memories of eight brave soldiers from the Third District of Nebraska who gave the ultimate sacrifice for the freedom of our country.

Spc. Dennis B. Morgan, 22, of Valentine, Nebrask; Pvt. Noah L. Boye, 21, of Grand Island, Nebraska; Sgt. Cory R. Mracek, 26, of Hay Springs, Nebraska; Sgt. Dennis A. Corral, 33, of Kearney, Nebraska; Spc. James R. Wolf, 21, of Scottsbluff, Nebraska; Spc. Blake C. Kelly, 21 of Columbus, Nebraska; Petty Officer 3rd Class David J. Moreno, 26, Gering, Nebraska; and Capt. Travis A. Ford, 30, of Ogallala, Nebraska.

Having been in Iraq and Afghanistan just a few months ago, I fully appreciate the character and commitment of our troops.

We are truly blessed to have this quality of soldiers protecting our country.

We will never be able to express to these families our appreciation for what their loved ones have sacrificed for our freedom.

I know that words cannot lessen the grief that each family is experiencing.

I want you to know that I share some of that grief, because all of us in Congress feel deeply responsible for our troops.

I can assure you that these eight soldiers have not been lost in vain.

All of us are resolved to see this matter through to a successful conclusion, so that Dennis; Noah; Cory; Dennis; James; Blake; David; and Travis sacrifice and memory are honored.

Mr. Speaker, may we all take a moment this Memorial Day to remember that our freedom has been bought with a price.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave soldiers who have given their lives while serving our great Nation during war. For 136 years American citizens have used Memorial Day as a special day to honor the servicemen and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Flowers and candles are lit on the graves of our heroes, ceremonies are held and Americans all over the country recognize the fallen soldiers in silence and solemnity.

Memorial Day is also a day where we should think about our values and appreciate how lucky we are to live in a free and democratic country. We should remember Franklin D. Roosevelt's words of January 6, 1941 when he outlined his hopes for a better future for the world. "In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings

which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighhbor—anywhere in the world.''

Memorial Day is a day when we should remember that there are still nations in the world which do not have these four freedoms. American soldiers are still fighting abroad to help people free themselves from oppression.

Sadly, this Memorial Day we also have to remember that we are a nation at war. But whatever we think about this war should not undermine our unity in support of the brave troops fighting in Iraq. America stands behind the servicemen and women who, day after day, risk their lives. Almost 800 U.S. men and women in uniform have been killed in Iraq to the current date. I submit a list of the names of these heroes to be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let us use Memorial Day to show our deep appreciation for these heroes. I again want to offer my sincerest sympathy to the families of the fallen soldiers. It is hard to imagine the pain these families are going through. But they can be assured that Americans will forever remember their loved ones with pride and gratefulness.

I have founded the Iraq Fallen Heroes Caucus to honor the fallen heroes and to actively support their families. Seventy-three Members of Congress—Democrats as well as Republicans—are already members of this caucus and I hope that more will join.

I again want to commend our soldiers for their great courage and willingness to fight for our country and encourage all Americans to use Memorial Day to honor our troops and remember those who have given their lives for the United States.

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Pfc. Howard Johnson II | 21 | AL | Mobile. |
| 6–Apr–03 | Army | Pvt. Kelley S. Prewitt | 24 | AL | Birmingham. |
| 14–Apr–03 | Army | Pfc. John E. Brown | 21 | AL | Troy. |
| 22–Apr–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Robert William Channell, Jr | 36 | AL | Tuscaloosa. |
| 24–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. Cedric L. Lennon | 32 | AL | West Blocton. |
| 28–Jun–03 | Army | Sgt. Timothy M. Conneway | 22 | AL | Enterprise. |
| 20–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Christopher R. Willoughby | 29 | AL | Phenix City. |
| 4–Sept–03 | Air Force | Tech. Sgt. Bruce E. Brown | 32 | AL | Coatopa. |
| 21–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Paul J. Bueche | 19 | AL | Daphne. |
| 27–Oct–03 | Army | Sgt. Aubrey D. Bell | 33 | AL | Tuskegee. |
| 26–Dec–03 | Army | Spc Charles G. Haight | 23 | AL | Jacksonville. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Philip A. Johnson, Jr | 31 | AL | Mobile. |
| 23–Jan–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Brian D. Hazelgrove | 29 | AL | Fort Rucker. |
| 16–Feb–04 | Army | Spc. Christopher M. Taylor | 25 | AL | Daphne. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Ahmed A. Cason | 24 | AL | McCalla. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Stephen D. Hiller | 25 | AL | Opelika. |
| 10–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. John T. Sims, Jr | 21 | AL | Alexander City. |
| 25–Mar–03 | Navy | Hospital Corpsman 3rd Class Michael Vann Johnson | 25 | AR | Little Rock. |
| 26–Jul–03 | Army | Pfc. Jonathan M. Cheatham | 19 | AR | Camden. |
| 12–Sep–03 | Army | Master Sgt. Kevin N. Morehead | 33 | AR | Little Rock. |
| 18–Mar–04 | Marine | Pfc. Brandon C. Smith | 20 | AR | Washington. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class William W. Labadie, Jr | 45 | AR | Bauxite. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Stacy C. Brandon | 35 | AR | Hazen. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Army | Capt. Arthur L. Felder | 36 | AR | Lewisville. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Patrick W. Kordsmeier | 49 | AR | North Little Rock. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Billy J. Orton | 41 | AR | Humnoke. |
| 6–May–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Hesley Box | 24 | AR | Nashville. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Pfc. Lori Ann Piestewa | 23 | AZ | Tuba City. |
| 28–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Fernando Padilla-Ramirez | 26 | AZ | Yuma. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Navy | Lt. Nathan D. White | 30 | AZ | Mesa. |
| 18–Jun–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. William T. Latham | 29 | AZ | Kingman. |
| 26–Jun–03 | Navy | Seaman Joshua McIntosh | 22 | AZ | Kingman. |
| 30–Aug–03 | Army | Sgt. Sean K. Cataudella | 28 | AZ | Tucson. |
| 15–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Alyssa R. Peterson | 27 | AZ | Flagstaff. |
| 6–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Spencer T. Karol | 20 | AZ | Woodruff. |
| 17–Oct–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Michael J. Williams | 31 | AZ | Yuma. |
| 28–Oct–03 | Army | Spec. Issac Campoy | 21 | AZ | Douglas. |
| 24–Dec–03 | Army | Command Sgt. Major Eric F. Cooke | 43 | AZ | Scottsdale. |
| 9–Feb–04 | Army | Sgt. Elijah Tai Wah Wong | 42 | AZ | Mesa. |
| 17–Feb–04 | Army | Spc. Michael M. Merila | 23 | AZ | Sierra Vista. |
| 25–Feb–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Matthew C. Laskowski | 32 | AZ | Phoenix. |
| 12–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Robert P. Zurheide, Jr | 20 | AZ | Tucson. |
| 21–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Jose Gutierrez | 22 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 22–Mar–03 | Navy | Lt. Thomas Mullen Adams | 27 | CA | La Mesa. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl Randal Kent Rosacker | 21 | CA | San Diego. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Michael E. Bitz | 31 | CA | Ventura. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl Jose A. Garibay | 21 | CA | Costa Mesa. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl. Jorge A. Gonzalez | 20 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 25–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Patrick T. O'Day | 20 | CA | Sonoma. |
| 25–Mar–03 | Marine | Pfc. Francisco A. Martinez-Flores | 21 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 27–Mar–03 | Marine | Gunnery Sgt. Joseph Menusa | 33 | CA | San Jose. |
| 27–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Jesus A. Suarez del Solar | 20 | CA | Escondido. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Erik H. Silva | 22 | CA | Chula Vista. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Army | Pvt. Devon D. Jones | 19 | CA | San Diego. |
| 8–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class John W. Marshall | 50 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 12–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Jesus A. Gonzalez | 22 | CA | Indio. |
| 24–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. Troy David Jenkins | 25 | CA | Ridgecrest. |
| 25–Apr–03 | Army | 1st Lt. Osbaldo Orozco | 26 | CA | Delano. |
| 12–May–03 | Marine | Pfc. Jose Franci Gonzalez Rodriguez | 19 | CA | Norwalk. |
| 18–May–03 | Marine | Cpl. Douglas Jose Marencoreyes | 28 | CA | Chino. |
| 19–May–03 | Marine | Capt. Andrew David La Mont | 31 | CA | Eureka. |
| 19–May–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Jason William Moore | 21 | CA | San Marcos. |
| 3–Jun–03 | Army | Sgt. Atanacio Haro Marin | 27 | CA | Baldwin Park. |
| 19–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. Paul T. Nakamura | 21 | CA | Santa Fe Springs. |
| 25–Jun–03 | Army | Spec. Andrew F. Chris | 25 | CA | San Diego. |
| 9–Jul–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Jason Andrew Tetrault | 20 | CA | Moreno Valley. |
| 15–Jul–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Cory Ryan Geurin | 18 | CA | Santee. |
| 24–Jul–03 | Army | Cpl. Evan Asa Ashcraft | 24 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 10–Aug–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. David S. Perry | 36 | CA | Bakersfield. |
| 12–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Daniel R. Parker | 18 | CA | Lake Elsinore. |
| 21–Aug–03 | Navy | Lt. Kylan A. Jones-Huffman | 31 | CA | Aptos. |
| 25–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Pablo Manzano | 19 | CA | Heber. |
| 9–Oct–03 | Army | Pvt. Sean A. Silva | 23 | CA | Roseville. |
| 13–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Jose Casanova | 23 | CA | El Monte. |
| 16–Oct–03 | Army | Cpl. Sean R. Grilley | 24 | CA | San Bernardino. |
| 24–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Jose L. Mora | 26 | CA | Bell Gardens. |
| 24–Oct–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael S. Hancock | 29 | CA | Yreka. |
| 26–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Steven Acosta | 19 | CA | Calexico. |
| 31–Oct–03 | Army | 2nd Lt. Todd J. Bryant | 23 | CA | Riverside. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Karina S. Lau | 20 | CA | Livingston. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Paul A. Velazquez | 29 | CA | San Diego. |
| 11–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Genaro Acosta | 26 | CA | Fair Oaks. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Kelly Bolor | 37 | CA | Whittier. |
| 23–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Rel A. Ravago IV | 21 | CA | Glendale. |
| 23–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Eddie E. Menyweather | 35 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 23–Nov–03 | Army | CW2 Christopher G. Nason | 39 | CA | Los Angeles. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Stephen A. Bertolino | 40 | CA | Orange. |
| 2–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Ryan C. Young | 21 | CA | Corona. |
| 5–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Arron R. Clark | 20 | CA | Chico. |
| 8–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Steven H. Bridges | 33 | CA | Tracy. |
| 10–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Richard A. Burdick | 24 | CA | National City. |
| 26–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Michael G. Mihalakis | 18 | CA | San Jose. |
| 30–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Justin W. Pollard | 21 | CA | Foothill Ranch. |
| 7–Jan–04 | Army | Pfc. Jesse D. Mizener | 24 | CA | Auburn. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Michael A. Diraimondo | 22 | CA | Simi Valley. |
| 14–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Keicia M. Hines | 27 | CA | Citrus Heights. |
| 24–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Jason K. Chappell | 22 | CA | Hemet. |
| 31–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Eliu A. Miersandoval | 27 | CA | San Clemente. |
| 10–Feb–04 | Air Force | Master Sgt. Jude C. Mariano | 39 | CA | Vallejo. |
| 11–Feb–04 | Army | Sgt. Patrick S. Tainsh | 33 | CA | Oceanside. |
| 12–Feb–04 | Army | Spc. Eric U. Ramirez | 31 | CA | San Diego. |
| 11–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Christopher K. Hill | 26 | CA | Ventura. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Joel K. Brattain | 21 | CA | Santa Ana. |
| 20–Mar–04 | Army | Maj. Mark D. Taylor | 41 | CA | Stockton. |
| 20–Mar–04 | Army | 1st Lt. Michael W. Vega | 41 | CA | Lathrop. |
| 22–Mar–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Andrew S. Dang | 20 | CA | Foster City. |
| 30–Mar–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. William J. Wiscowiche | 20 | CA | Victorville. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Michael W. Mitchell | 25 | CA | Porterville. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Casey Sheehan | 24 | CA | Vacaville. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Marcus M. Cherry | 18 | CA | Imperial. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Kyle D. Crowley | 18 | CA | San Ramon. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Travis J. Layfield | 19 | CA | Fremont. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Allan K. Walker | 28 | CA | Lancaster. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | Staff Sgt. William M. Harrell | 30 | CA | Placentia. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | 1st Lt. Joshua M. Palmer | 25 | CA | Banning. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Eric A. Ayon | 26 | CA | Arleta. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Marine | 1st Lt. Oscar Jimenez | 34 | CA | San Diego. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. George D. Torres | 23 | CA | Long Beach. |
| 12–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Brad S. Shuder | 21 | CA | El Dorado. |
| 13–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Victor A. Rosaleslomeli | 29 | CA | Westminister. |
| 15–Apr–04 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Jimmy J. Arroyave | 30 | CA | Woodland. |
| 16–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Brian M. Wood | 21 | CA | Torrence. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Marine | Capt. Richard J. Gannon II | 31 | CA | Escondido. |
| 18–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Christopher A. Gibson | 23 | CA | Simi Valley. |
| 20–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Leroy Harris-Kelly | 20 | CA | Azusa. |
| 27–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Abraham D. Penamedina | 32 | CA | Los Angeles. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. James L. Beckstrand | 27 | CA | Escondido. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Adam W. Estep | 23 | CA | Campbell. |
| 1–May–04 | Army | Spc. Ramon C. Ojeda | 22 | CA | Ramona. |
| 1–May–04 | Army | Spc. Trevor A. Win'E | 22 | CA | Orange. |
| 3–May–04 | Army | Pfc. Lyndon A. Marcus, Jr | 21 | CA | Long Beach. |
| 3–May–04 | Army | Sgt. Marvin R. Sprayberry III | 24 | CA | Tehachapi. |
| 13–May–04 | Marine | Pfc. Brian K. Cutter | 19 | CA | Riverside. |
| 14–May–04 | Army | Sgt. Brud J. Cronkrite | 22 | CA | Spring Valley. |
| 14–May–04 | Army | Pfc. Michael A. Mora | 19 | CA | Arroyo Grande. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Thomas J. Slocum | 22 | CO | Thornton. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Capt. Russell B. Rippetoe | 27 | CO | Arvada. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Randall S. Rehn | 36 | CO | Longmont. |
| 27–May–03 | Army | Sgt. Thomas F. Broomhead | 34 | CO | Canon City. |
| 7–Jul–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Barry Sandford Sr | 46 | CO | Aurora. |
| 29–Aug–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Mark A. Lawton | 41 | CO | Hayden. |
| 24–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael E. Yashinski | 24 | CO | Monument. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Chance R. Phelps | 19 | CO | Clifton. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Ryan E. Reed | 20 | CO | Colorado Springs. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Phillip A. Jordan | 42 | CT | Enfield. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl. Kemaphoom A. Chanawongse | 22 | CT | Waterford. |
| 20–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Jason D. Jordan | 24 | CT | Enfield. |
| 26–Jul–03 | Army | Pfc. Wilfredo Perez, Jr | 24 | CT | Norwalk. |
| 12–Aug–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Richard S. Eaton, Jr | 37 | CT | Guilford. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Anthony D. D'Agostino | 20 | CT | Waterbury. |
| 12–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Jeffrey F. Braun | 19 | CT | Stafford. |
| 7–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Tyanna S. Felder | 22 | CT | Bridgeport. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Felix M. Delgreco | 22 | CT | Simsbury. |
| 25–Jun–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Gregory E. MacDonald | 29 | DC | Washington. |
| 26–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Darryl T. Dent | 21 | DC | Washington. |
| 30–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Brian McGinnis | 23 | DE | Saint Georges. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Ryan P. Long | 21 | DE | Seaford. |
| 7–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Jarrett B. Thompson | 27 | DE | Dover. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Anthony P. Roberts | 18 | DE | Bear. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Brian Rory Buesing | 20 | FL | Cedar Key. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Wilbert Davis | 40 | FL | Tampa. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Paul R. Smith | 33 | FL | Tampa. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Andrew Julian Aviles | 18 | FL | Palm Beach. |
| 14–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Armando Ariel Gonzalez | 25 | FL | Hialeah. |
| 17–Apr–03 | Army | Cpl. John T. Rivero | 23 | FL | Tampa. |
| 26–May–03 | Army | Sgt. Keman L. Mitchell | 24 | FL | Hilliard. |
| 27–May–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Michael B. Quinn | 37 | FL | Tampa. |
| 6–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Jeffrey M. Wershow | 22 | FL | Gainesville. |
| 3–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Charles M. Sims | 18 | FL | Miami. |
| 12–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Robert A. Wise | 21 | FL | Tallahassee. |
| 20–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Robert D. Roberts | 21 | FL | Winter Park. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Aaron A. Weaver | 32 | FL | Inverness. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Ian D. Manuel | 23 | FL | |
| 17–Jan–04 | Army | Pfc. Cody J. Orr | 21 | FL | Ruskin. |
| 17–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Edmond L. Randle | 26 | FL | Miami. |
| 1–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Michael R. Woodliff | 22 | FL | Port Charlotte. |
| 17–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Tracy L. Laramore | 30 | FL | Okaloosa. |
| 24–Mar–04 | Army | SSgt. Wentz Jerome Henry Shanaberger III | 33 | FL | Naples. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Christopher R. Cobb | 19 | FL | Brandenton. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Raymond E. Jones, Jr | 31 | FL | Gainesville. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Jonathan N. Hartman | 27 | FL | Jacksonville. |
| 20–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Bradley C. Fox | 34 | FL | Orlando. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Jeremy Ricardo Ewing | 22 | FL | Miami. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Justin B. Schmidt | 23 | FL | Bradenton. |
| 30–Apr–04 | Navy | Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Jason B. Dwelley | 31 | FL | Apopka. |
| 2–May–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 2nd Class Michael C. Anderson | 36 | FL | Daytona |
| 2–May–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 2nd Class Trace W. Dossett | 37 | FL | Orlando. |
| 2–May–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 3rd Class Ronald A. Ginther | 37 | FL | Auburndale. |
| 2–May–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 2nd Class Robert B. Jenkins | 35 | FL | Stuart. |
| 2–May–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 2nd Class Scott R. Mchugh | 33 | FL | Boca Raton. |
| 2–May–04 | Army | Capt. John E. Tipton | 32 | FL | Fort Walton Beach. |
| 3–May–04 | Army | 1st Lt. Christopher J. Kenny | 32 | FL | Miami. |
| 6–May–04 | Marine | Cpl. Dustin H. Schrage | 20 | FL | Brevard. |
| 8–May–05 | Marine | Cpl. Ronald R. Payne, Jr | 23 | FL | Lakeland. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. Jamaal R. Addison | 22 | GA | Roswell. |
| 29–Mar–03 | Army | Pfc. Diego Fernando Rincon | 19 | GA | Conyers. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29–Mar–03 | Army | Pfc. Michael Russell Creighton Weldon | 20 | GA | Conyers. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Capt. Edward J. Korn | 31 | GA | Savannah. |
| 14–May–03 | Army | Spc. David T. Nutt | 32 | GA | Blackshear. |
| 12–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. John K. Klinesmith, Jr | 25 | GA | Stockbridge. |
| 14–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael T. Crockett | 27 | GA | Soperton. |
| 28–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Nathaniel Hart, Jr | 29 | GA | Valdosta. |
| 20–Aug–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Bobby C. Franklin | 38 | GA | Mineral Bluff. |
| 13–Oct–03 | Army | Pvt. Benjamin L. Freeman | 19 | GA | Valdosta. |
| 23–Nov–03 | Army | Command Sgt. Maj. Jerry L. Wilson | 45 | GA | Thomson. |
| 11–Dec–03 | Army | Spec. Marshall L. Edgerton | 27 | GA | Rocky Face. |
| 17–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Christopher J. Holland | 26 | GA | Brunswick. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Nathaniel H. Johnson | 22 | GA | Augusta. |
| 12–Jan–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Ricky L. Crockett | 37 | GA | Broxton. |
| 15–Mar–04 | Army | Sgt. William J. Normandy | 42 | GA | Augusta. |
| 16–Mar–04 | Army | Master Sgt. Thomas R. Thigpen, Sr | 52 | GA | Augusta. |
| 2–Apr–2004 | Army | Pfc. William R. Strange | 19 | GA | Adrian. |
| 10–Apr–04 | Air Force | Airman 1st Class Antoine J. Holt | 20 | GA | Kennesaw. |
| 10–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Justin W. Johnson | 22 | GA | Rome. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Marvin A. Camposiles | 25 | GA | Austell. |
| 27–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Marquis A. Whitaker | 20 | GA | Columbus. |
| 30–Apr–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 3rd Class Christopher M. Dickerson | 33 | GA | Eastman. |
| 1–Sep–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Cameron B. Sarno | 43 | HI | Waipahu. |
| 24–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Bradley S. Korthaus | 28 | IA | Davenport. |
| 10–Apr–03 | Marine | Gunnery Sgt. Jeffrey E. Bohr, Jr | 39 | IA | Ossian. |
| 26–May–03 | Army | Pvt. Kenneth A. Nalley | 19 | IA | Hamburg. |
| 31–Jul–03 | Army | Pvt. Michael J. Deutsch | 21 | IA | Dubuque. |
| 14–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. David M. Kirchhoff | 31 | IA | Cedar Rapds. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Bruce A. Smith | 41 | IA | West Liberty. |
| 6–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Paul F. Fisher | 39 | IA | Cedar Rapids. |
| 8–Nov–03 | Army | Pvt. Kurt R. Frosheiser | 22 | IA | Des Moines. |
| 29–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Aaron J. Sissel | 22 | IA | Tipton. |
| 5–Feb–04 | Army | Spc. Joshua Knowles | 23 | IA | Sheffield. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Benjamin R. Carman | 20 | IA | Jefferson. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Michael R. Speer | 24 | IA | Davenport. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Marine | Pfc. Brandon C. Sturdy | 19 | IA | Urbandale. |
| 24–Mar–03 | Air National Guard | Maj. Gregory Stone | 40 | ID | Boise. |
| 9–May–03 | Army | Cpl. Richard P. Carl | 26 | ID | Glenns Ferry. |
| 10–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Jerrick M. Petty | 25 | ID | Idaho Falls. |
| 31–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Cleston C. Raney | 20 | ID | Rupert. |
| 20–Mar–03 | Marine | Capt. Ryan Anthony Beaupre | 30 | IL | Bloomington. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Andrew R. Pokorny | 30 | IL | Naperville. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Pvt. Jonathan L. Gifford | 30 | IL | Decatur. |
| 24–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl. Evan T. James | 20 | IL | La Harpe. |
| 31–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. Brandon J. Rowe | 20 | IL | Roscoe. |
| 5–Apr–03 | Marine | 1st Sgt. Edward Smith | 38 | IL | Chicago. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Lincoln D. Hollinsaid | 27 | IL | Malden. |
| 12–May–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Jakub Henryk Kowalik | 21 | IL | Schaumburg. |
| 13–May–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Nicholas Brian Kleiboeker | 19 | IL | Irvington. |
| 19–May–03 | Marine | 1st Lt. Timothy Louis Ryan | 30 | IL | Aurora. |
| 26–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. Corey A. Hubbell | 20 | IL | Urbana. |
| 8–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Brandon Ramsey | 21 | IL | Calumet City. |
| 8–Aug–03 | Army | Pvt. Matthew D. Bush | 20 | IL | East Alton. |
| 2–Sep–03 | Army | Pfc. Christopher A. Sisson | 20 | IL | Oak Park. |
| 9–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Ryan G. Carlock | 25 | IL | Macomb. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | 1st Lt. Brian D. Slavenas | 30 | IL | Genoa |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. William D. Dusenbery | 30 | IL | Fairview Heights. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. John R. Sullivan | 26 | IL | Countryside. |
| 20–Nov–03 | Army | Pvt. Scott M. Tyrrell | 21 | IL | Sterling. |
| 1–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Uday Singh | 21 | IL | Lake Forest. |
| 26–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Michael Sutter | 28 | IL | Tinley Park. |
| 17–Mar–04 | Army | Sgt. Ivory L. Phipps | 44 | IL | Chicago. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Cpl. Forest J. Jostes | 22 | IL | Albion. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Geoffery S. Morris | 19 | IL | Gurnee. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Phillip E. Frank | 20 | IL | Elk Grove. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Gregory R. Goodrich | 37 | IL | Bartonville. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Torrey L. Gray | 19 | IL | Patoka. |
| 23–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Shawn C. Edwards | 20 | IL | Bensenville. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Landis W. Garrison | 23 | IL | Rapids City. |
| 1–May–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Oscar D. Vargas-Medina | 32 | IL | Chicago. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. David K. Fribley | 26 | IN | Warsaw. |
| 24–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. Gregory P. Sanders | 19 | IN | Hobart. |
| 26–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. William A. Jeffries | 39 | IN | Evansville. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Marine | Sgt. Duane R. Rios | 25 | IN | Griffith. |
| 22–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Roy Russell Buckley | 24 | IN | Portage. |
| 10–May–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Matthew R. Smith | 20 | IN | Anderson. |
| 7–Jun–03 | Army | Pvt. Jesse M. Halling | 19 | IN | Indianapolis. |
| 16–Jun–03 | Army | Pvt. Shawn D. Pahnke | 25 | IN | Shelbyville. |
| 7–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Chad L. Keith | 21 | IN | Batesville. |
| 8–Jul–03 | Army | Pvt. Robert L. McKinley | 23 | IN | Kokomo. |
| 8–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Craig A. Boling | 38 | IN | Elkhart. |
| 5–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Ronald D. Allen Jr. | 22 | IN | Mitchell. |
| 20–Sep–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Frederick L. Miller, Jr | 27 | IN | Hagerstown. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Brian H. Penisten | 28 | IN | Fort Wayne. |
| 6–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. James A. Chance III | 25 | IN | KoKomo. |
| 23–Nov–03 | Army | Cpl. Darrell Smith | 28 | IN | Otwell. |
| 12–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Jarrod W. Black | 26 | IN | Peru. |
| 5–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Luke P. Frist | 20 | IN | West Lafayette. |
| 21–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Christopher E. Hudson | 21 | IN | Carmel. |
| 4–4–2004 | Army | Pfc. John D. Amos II | 22 | IN | Valparaiso. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Deryk L. Hallal | 24 | IN | Indianapolis. |
| 1–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. Jacob L. Butler | 24 | KS | Wellsville. |
| 15–Jun–03 | Marine | Pfc. Ryan R. Cox | 19 | KS | Derby. |
| 25–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Kyle G. Thomas | 23 | KS | Topeka. |
| 30–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Dustin K. McGaugh | 20 | KS | Derby. |
| 20–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Joseph L. Lister | 22 | KS | Pleasanton. |
| 31–Jan–04 | Army | Cpt. Juan C. Cabralbanuelos | 25 | KS | Emporia. |
| 21–Mar–04 | Army | Pvt. Dustin L. Kreider | 19 | KS | Riverton. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Christopher B. Wasser | 21 | KS | Ottawa. |
| 2–May–04 | Army | Pvt. Jeremy L. Drexler | 23 | KS | Topeka. |
| 29–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. Darrin K. Potter | 24 | KY | Louisville. |
| 12–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. James E. Powell | 26 | KY | Radcliff. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael D. Acklin II | 25 | KY | Louisville. |
| 21–Nov–03 | Army | Cpl. Gary B. Coleman | 24 | KY | Pikeville. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. James T. Hoffman | 41 | KY | Whitesburg. |
| 19–Feb–04 | Army | 2nd Lt. Jeffrey C. Graham | 24 | KY | Elizabethtown. |
| 7–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. George S. Rentschler | 31 | KY | Louisville. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Nicholas J. Dieruf | 21 | KY | Versailles. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | 1st Lt. Robert L. Henderson II | 33 | KY | Alvaton. |
| 14–May–04 | Army | Sgt. James W. Harlan | 44 | KY | Owensboro. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Army | Pfc. Wilfred D. Bellard | 20 | LA | Lake Charles. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Levi B. Kinchen | 21 | LA | Tickfaw. |
| 9–Aug–03 | Army | Sgt. Floyd G. Knighten, Jr | 55 | LA | Olla. |
| 12–Aug–03 | Army | Sgt. Taft V. Williams | 29 | LA | New Orleans. |
| 29–Sep–03 | Army | Pfc. Kristian E. Parker | 23 | LA | Slidell. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Craig Davis | 37 | LA | Opelousas. |
| 7–Mar–04 | Army | Capt. Gussie M. Jones | 41 | LA | |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Toby W. Mallet | 26 | LA | Kaplan. |
| 14–May–04 | Army | Command Sgt. Maj. Edward C. Barnhill | 50 | LA | Shreveport. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Mathew G. Boule | 22 | MA | Dracut. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Marine | Capt. Benjamin W. Sammis | 29 | MA | Rehoboth. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Marine | 1st Lt. Brian M. McPhillips | 25 | MA | Pembroke. |
| 20–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Justin W. Garvey | 23 | MA | Townsend. |
| 1–Sep–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Joseph Camara | 40 | MA | New Bedford. |
| 16–Oct–03 | Staff | Sgt. Joseph P. Bellavia | 28 | MA | Wakefield. |
| 18–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. John D. Hart | 20 | MA | Bedford. |
| 7–Nov–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Kyran E. Kennedy | 43 | MA | Boston. |
| 18–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Glenn R. Allison | 24 | MA | Pittsfield. |
| 23–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Theodore L. Perreault | 33 | MA | Webster. |
| 21–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Gabriel T. Palacios | 22 | MA | Lynn. |
| 25–Feb–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Stephen M. Wells | 29 | MA | Egremont. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Army | Sgt. Daniel J. Londono | 22 | MA | Boston. |
| 19–Mar–04 | Marine | Cpl. David M. Vicente | 25 | MA | Methuen. |
| 25–Mar–04 | Marine | LCpl. Jeffrey C. Burgess | 20 | MA | Plymouth. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Peter G. Enos | 24 | MA | South Dartmouth. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Norman Darling | 29 | MA | Middleboro. |
| 20–Mar–03 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Kendall Dannon Waters-Bey | 29 | MD | Baltimore. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. George A. Mitchell | 35 | MD | Rawlings. |
| 14–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Jason David Mileo | 20 | MD | Centreville. |
| 8–Nov–03 | Army | Command Sgt. Maj. Cornell W. Gilmore I | 45 | MD | Baltimore. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Jeffrey C. Walker | 33 | MD | Havre de Grace. |
| 25–Jan–04 | Army | Lt. Adam G. Mooney | 28 | MD | Cambridge. |
| 13–Feb–04 | Army | Pvt. Bryan N. Spry | 19 | MD | Chestertown. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Jason C. Ford | 21 | MD | Bowie. |
| 3/31/2004 | Army | Pvt. Brandon L. Davis | 20 | MD | Cumberland. |
| 15–May–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Bruce E. Price | 37 | MD | |
| 20–Mar–03 | Marine | Maj. Jay Thomas Aubin | 36 | ME | Waterville. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Daniel Francis J. Cunningham | 33 | ME | Lewiston. |
| 7–Nov–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Sharon T. Swartworth | 43 | ME | Litchfield. |
| 3/29/2004 | Army | Spc. Jeremiah J. Holmes | 27 | ME | North Berwick. |
| 20–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Christopher D. Gelineau | 23 | ME | Portland. |
| 26–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Lawrence A. Roukey | 33 | ME | Westbrook. |
| 26–Mar–03 | Marine | Maj. Kevin Nave | 36 | MI | Union. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael F. Pedersen | 26 | MI | Flint. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Sgt. Todd J. Robbins | 33 | MI | Pentwater. |
| 8–Apr–03 | Army | Pfc. Jason M. Meyer | 23 | MI | Swartz Creek. |
| 8–Apr–03 | Air Force | Staff Sgt. Scott D. Sather | 29 | MI | Clio. |
| 8–Apr–03 | Marine | Pfc. Juan Guadalupe Garza, Jr | 20 | MI | Temperance. |
| 14–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Richard A. Goward | 32 | MI | Midland. |
| 3–May–03 | Army | Sgt. Sean C. Reynolds | 25 | MI | East Lansing. |
| 16–May–03 | Army | Master Sgt. William L. Payne | 46 | MI | Otsego. |
| 26–May–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Brett J. Petriken | 30 | MI | Flint. |
| 13–Jul–03 | Army | Capt. Paul J. Cassidy | 36 | MI | Laingsburg. |
| 6–Aug–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Brian R. Hellermann | 35 | MI | Freeport. |
| 14–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. Trevor A. Blumberg | 22 | MI | Canton. |
| 13–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Donald L. Wheeler | 22 | MI | Concord. |
| 20–Oct–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Paul J. Johnson | 29 | MI | Calumet. |
| 24–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Artimus D. Brassfield | 22 | MI | Flint. |
| 8–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Mark D. Vasquez | 35 | MI | Port Huron. |
| 22–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Damian S. Bushart | 22 | MI | Waterford. |
| 8–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Jason G. Wright | 19 | MI | Luzerne. |
| 25–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Thomas W. Christensen | 42 | MI | Atlantic Mine. |
| 25–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Stephen C. Hattamer | 43 | MI | Gwinn. |
| 31–Jan–04 | Army | Pfc. Holly J. McGeogh | 19 | MI | Taylor. |
| 14–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Richard K. Trevithick | 20 | MI | Gaines. |
| 3–Jul–03 | Army | Pfc. Edward J. Herrgott | 20 | MN | Shakopee. |
| 17–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Dale A. Panchot | 26 | MN | Northome. |
| 25–Jan–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Patrick D. Dorff | 32 | MN | Elk River. |
| 8–Mar–04 | Marine | Pfc. Matthew G. Milczark | 18 | MN | Kettle River. |
| 4/4/2004 | Marine | Cpl. Tyler R. Fey | 22 | MN | Eden Prarie. |
| 4/5/2004 | Marine | Pfc. Moises A. Langhorst | 19 | MN | Moose Lake. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Levi T. Angell | 20 | MN | Saint Louis. |
| 8–May–0? | Army | Spc. James J. Holmes | 28 | MN | East Grand Forks. |
| 22–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Nicholas M. Hodson | 22 | MO | Smithville. |
| 1–May–03 | Army | Pfc. Jesse A. Givens | 34 | MO | Springfield. |
| 26–May–03 | Army | Pfc. Jeremiah D. Smith | 25 | MO | Odessa. |
| 6–Jun–03 | Army | Sgt. Travis L. Burkhardt | 26 | MO | Edina. |
| 12–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Joshua M. Neusche | 20 | MO | Montreal. |
| 18–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Joel L. Bertoldie | 20 | MO | Independence. |
| 26–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Jonathan P. Barnes | 21 | MO | Anderson. |
| 26–Oct–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Jamie L. Huggins | 26 | MO | Hume. |
| 7–Nov–03 | Army | Capt. Joseph B. Smith | 29 | MO | Monroe City. |
| 23–Jan–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Michael T. Blaise | 29 | MO | Macon. |
| 9–Mar–04 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Richard S. Gottfried | 42 | MO | Lake Ozark. |
| 25–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Kenneth A. Melton | 30 | MO | Westplains. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Ryan M. Campbell | 25 | MO | Kirksville. |
| 21–Mar–03 | Marine | 2nd Lt. Therrel S. Childers | 30 | MS | Harrison County. |
| 5–Apr–03 | Army | Cpl. Henry L. Brown | 22 | MS | Natchez. |
| 8–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Larry K. Brown | 22 | MS | Jackson. |
| 28–May–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Kenneth R. Bradley | 39 | MS | Utica. |
| 1–Jun–03 | Marine | Sgt. Jonathan W. Lambert | 28 | MS | New Site. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Joe N. Wilson | 30 | MS | Crystal Springs. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Jeremy DiGiovanni | 21 | MS | Tylertown. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Damian L. Heidelberg | 21 | MS | Batesville. |
| 2–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Raphael S. Davis | 24 | MS | Tutwiler. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Clint D. Ferrin | 31 | MS | Picayune. |
| 7–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Christpher D. Mabry | 19 | MS | Chunky. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Jeffrey F. Dayton | 27 | MS | Caledonia. |
| 1–May–04 | Army | Sgt. Joshua S. Ladd | 20 | MS | Port Gibson. |
| 22–Dec–03 | Army | 1st Lt. Edward M. Saltz | 27 | MT | Bigfork. |
| 28–Mar–03 | Army | Sgt. Roderic A. Solomon | 32 | NC | Fayetteville. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Brian E. Anderson | 26 | NC | Durham. |
| 22–Apr–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Alan Dinh Lam | 19 | NC | Snow Camp. |
| 17–Jun–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael L. Tosto | 24 | NC | Apex. |
| 6–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. David B. Parson | 30 | NC | Kannapolis. |
| 21–Jul–03 | Army | Cpl. Mark A. Bibby | 25 | NC | Watha. |
| 31–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. James I. Lambert III | 22 | NC | Raleigh. |
| 6–Aug–03 | Army | Sgt. Leonard D. Simmons | 33 | NC | New Bern. |
| 20–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Lunsford B. Brown II | 27 | NC | Creedmoor. |
| 26–Oct–03 | Army | Pvt. Joseph R. Guerrera | 20 | NC | Dunn. |
| 26–Oct–03 | Army | Lt. Col. Charles H. Buehring | 40 | NC | Fayetteville. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Scott C. Rose | 30 | NC | Fayetteville. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Joey Whitener | 19 | NC | Nebo. |
| 20–Feb–04 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Henry A. Bacon | 45 | NC | Wagram. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Jocelyn L. Carrasquillo | 28 | NC | Wrightsville Beach. |
| 7–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Marvin L. Miller | 38 | NC | Dunn. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Elmer C. Krause | 40 | NC | Greensboro. |
| 3–May–04 | Army | Sgt. Gregory L. Wahl | 30 | NC | Salisbury. |
| 9–May–05 | Army | Sgt. Rodney A. Murray | 28 | NC | Ayden. |
| 22–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Jon P. Fettig | 30 | ND | Dickinson. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Sheldon R. Hawk Eagle | 21 | ND | Grand Forks. |
| 27–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Thomas J. Sweet II | 23 | ND | Bismarck. |
| 24–Jan–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Kenneth W. Hendrickson | 41 | ND | Bismarck. |
| 8–May–05 | Army | Spc. Philip D. Brown | 21 | ND | Jamestown. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Marine | Capt. Travis A. Ford | 30 | NE | Ogallala. |
| 21–May–03 | Army | Spc. Nathaniel A. Caldwell | 27 | NE | Omaha. |
| 17–Jul–03 | Navy | Hospital Corpsman 3rd Class David J. Moreno | 26 | NE | Gering. |
| 9–Oct–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Christopher W. Swisher | 26 | NE | Lincoln. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Daniel Bader | 28 | NE | York. |
| 6–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. James R. Wolf | 21 | NE | Scottsbluff. |
| 1–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Dennis A. Corral | 33 | NE | Kearney. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Cory R. Mracek | 26 | NE | Hay Springs. |
| 13–Apr–04 | Marine | Pvt. Noah L. Boye | 21 | NE | Grand Island. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Dennis B. Morgan | 22 | NE | Valentine. |
| 25–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Robert E. Rooney | 43 | NH | Nashua. |
| 24–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Rany S. Rosenberg | 23 | NH | Berlin. |
| 3/30/2004 | Army | Master Sgt. Richard L. Ferguson | 45 | NH | Conway. |
| 29–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. Michael Edward Curtin | 23 | NJ | Howell. |
| 10–Apr–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Terry W. Hemingway | 39 | NJ | Willingboro. |
| 13–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Gil Mercado | 25 | NJ | Paterson. |
| 25–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Narson B. Sullivan | 21 | NJ | North Brunswick. |
| 30–May–03 | Army | Spc. Kyle A. Griffin | 20 | NJ | Emerson. |
| 28–Jun–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Gladimir Philippe | 37 | NJ | Linden. |
| 16–Jul–03 | Army | 2nd Lt. Richard Torres | 25 | NJ | |
| 1–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Simeon Hunte | 23 | NJ | Essex. |
| 11–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Marlon P. Jackson | 25 | NJ | Jersey City. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Ryan T. Baker | 24 | NJ | Brown Mills. |
| 2–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Marc S. Seiden | 26 | NJ | Brigantine. |
| 3–Feb–04 | Army | 2nd Lt. Seth J. Dvorin | 24 | NJ | East Brunswick. |
| 22–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Bruce Miller, Jr | 23 | NJ | Orange. |
| 25–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Adam D. Froelich | 21 | NJ | Pine Hill. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | 2nd Lt. John T. Wroblewski | 25 | NJ | Oak Ridge. |
| 14–May–04 | Army | Spc. Philip I. Spakosky | 25 | NJ | Browns Mill. |
| 4–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. James H. Pirtle | 27 | NM | Le Mesa. |
| 4–5–04 | Marine | Pfc. Christopher Ramos | 26 | NM | Albuquerque. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Lee D. Todacheene | 29 | NM | Farmington. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Donald J. Cline, Jr | 21 | NV | Washoe Valley. |
| 13–Jun–03 | Marine | 2nd Lt. Frederick E. Pokorney, Jr | 31 | NV | Tonopah. |
| 23–Jul–03 | Army | Capt. Joshua T. Byers | 29 | NV | Sparks. |
| 22–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Eric J. Orlowski | 26 | NY | Buffalo. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Pfc. Tamario D. Burkett | 21 | NY | Buffalo. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. Michael L. Williams | 46 | NY | Buffalo. |
| 27–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl. Robert M. Rodriguez | 21 | NY | Queens. |
| 29–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. William W. White | 24 | NY | Brooklyn. |
| 29–Mar–03 | Army | Sgt. Eugene Williams | 24 | NY | Highland. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Eric A. Smith | 41 | NY | Rochester. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Bernard G. Gooden | 22 | NY | Mount Vernon. |
| 6–Apr–03 | Army | Pfc. Gregory P. Huxley, Jr | 19 | NY | Forestport. |
| 11–Apr–03 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Riayan A. Tejeda | 26 | NY | New York. |
| 18–May–03 | Army | Spc. Rasheed Sahib | 22 | NY | Brooklyn. |
| 25–May–03 | Army | Pvt. David Evans, Jr | 18 | NY | Buffalo. |
| 24–Jul–03 | Army | Pfc. Raheen Tyson Heighter | 22 | NY | Bay Shore. |
| 27–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Heath A. McMillin | 29 | NY | Canandaigua. |
| 10–Sep–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Joseph E. Robsky, Jr | 31 | NY | Elizaville. |
| 15–Sep–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Kevin C. Kimmerly | 31 | NY | North Creek. |
| 20–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. David T. Friedrich | 26 | NY | Hammond. |
| 3–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Rayshawn S. Johnson | 20 | NY | Brooklyn. |
| 13–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Jacob S. Fletcher | 28 | NY | Bay Shore. |
| 14–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Irving Medina | 22 | NY | Middletown. |
| 20–Nov–03 | Army | Capt. George A. Wood | 33 | NY | New York. |
| 19–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Charles E. Bush, Jr | 43 | NY | Buffalo. |
| 29–Jan–04 | Army | Pfc. Luis A. Moreno | 19 | NY | Bronx. |
| 9–Feb–04 | Army | Sgt. Thomas D. Robbins | 27 | NY | Schenectady. |
| 19–Feb–04 | Army | Spc. Roger G. Ling | 20 | NY | Douglaston. |
| 18–Mar–04 | Army | Spec. Doron Chan | 20 | NY | Highland. |
| 27–Mar–2004 | Marine | Master Sgt. Timothy Toney | 37 | NY | Manhattan. |
| 4–5–2004 | Army | Spc. David M. McKeever | 25 | NY | Buffalo. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Isaac Michael Nieves | 20 | NY | Unadilla. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Nathan P. Brown | 21 | NY | South Glens Falls. |
| 13–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Kevin T. Kolm | 23 | NY | Hicksville. |
| 18–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Jason L. Dunham | 22 | NY | Allegany. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Coast Guard | Coast Guard Officer 3rd Class Nathan B. Bruckenthal | 24 | NY | Smithtown. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Navy | Navy Petty Officer 1st Class Michael J. Pernaselli | 27 | NY | Monroe. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Master Sgt. Robert J. Dowdy | 38 | OH | Cleveland. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Pvt. Brandon Ulysses Sloan | 19 | OH | Bedford Heights. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Marine | Pfc. Christian D. Gurtner | 19 | OH | Ohio City. |
| 8–May–03 | Army | Pfc. Marlin T. Rockhold | 23 | OH | Hamilton. |
| 9–May–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer 3 Brian K. Van Dusen | 39 | OH | Columbus. |
| 19–May–03 | Army | Lt. Col. Dominic R. Baragona | 42 | OH | Niles. |
| 5–Jun–03 | Army | Pfc. Branden F. Oberleitner | 20 | OH | Worthington. |
| 10–Jun–03 | Army | Pfc. Gavin L. Neighbor | 20 | OH | Somerset. |
| 28–Jun–03 | Army | Pfc. Kevin C. Ott | 27 | OH | Columbus. |
| 23–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Brett T. Christian | 27 | OH | North Royalton. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Steven D. Conover | 21 | OH | Wilmington. |
| 10–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Aaron T. Reese | 31 | OH | Reynoldsburg. |
| 10–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Todd M. Bates | 20 | OH | Bellaire. |
| 15–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Kenneth C. Souslin | 21 | OH | Mansfield. |
| 24–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Benjamin W. Biskie | 27 | OH | Vermillion. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Lester O. Kinney II | 27 | OH | Zanesville. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. Sean G. Landrus | 31 | OH | Thompson. |
| 8–Feb–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Richard P. Ramey | 27 | OH | Canton. |
| 18–Mar–04 | Marine | Cpl. Andrew D. Brownfield | 24 | OH | Summit. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Allen J. Vandayburg | 20 | OH | Mansfield. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Michael J. Smith, Jr | 21 | OH | Jefferson. |
| 5–May–04 | Army | Pfc. Jesse R. Buryj | 21 | OH | Canton. |
| 24–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Thomas A. Blair | 24 | OK | Wagoner. |
| 19–May–03 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Aaron Dean White | 27 | OK | Shawnee. |
| 6–Jun–03 | Navy | Petty Officer 3rd Class Doyle W. Bollinger, Jr | 21 | OK | Poteau. |
| 13–Aug–03 | Army | Sgt. Steven W. White | 29 | OK | Lawton. |
| 23–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Stephen M. Scott | 21 | OK | Lawton. |
| 22–Oct–03 | Army | Pvt. Jason M. Ward | 25 | OK | Tulsa. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Ross A. Pennanen | 36 | OK | Shawnee. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Luke S. James | 24 | OK | Hooker. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Lawrence S. Colton | 32 | OK | Oklahoma City. |
| 30–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Scott M. Vincent | 21 | OK | Bokoshe. |
| 3–May–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Erickson H. Petty | 28 | OK | Fort Gibson. |
| 5–May–04 | Army | Spc. James E. Marshall | 19 | OK | Tulsa. |
| 11–May–04 | Army | Spc. Kyle A. Brinlee | 21 | OK | Pryor. |
| 22–Mar–03 | Army | Reserve Spc. Brandon S. Tobler | 19 | OR | Portland. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Sgt. Donald Ralph Walters | 33 | OR | Salem. |
| 30–Mar–03 | Marine | Capt. Aaron J. Contreras | 31 | OR | Sherwood. |
| 8–Apr–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Robert A. Stever | 36 | OR | Pendleton. |
| 2–Jul–03 | Marine | Cpl. Travis J. Bradach-Nall | 21 | OR | Multnomah County. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Erik C. Kesterson | 29 | OR | Independence. |
| 8–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Christopher J. Rivera Wesley | 26 | OR | Portland. |
| 8–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Joseph M. Blickenstaff | 23 | OR | Corvallis. |
| 16–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Nathan W. Nakis | 19 | OR | Corvallis. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Travis A. Moothart | 23 | OR | Brownsville. |
| 11–Feb–04 | Army | Pfc. William C. Ramirez | 19 | OR | Portland. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Philip G. Rogers | 23 | OR | Gresham. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Gary F. VanLeuven | 20 | OR | Klamath Falls. |
| 8–May–04 | Army | Spc. Chase R. Whitham | 21 | OR | Eugene. |
| 17–May–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Bob W. Roberts | 30 | OR | Newport. |
| 22–Mar–03 | Army | Capt. Christopher Scott Seifert | 27 | PA | Easton. |
| 1–Apr–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Joseph B. Maglione | 22 | PA | Lansdale. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Donald S. Oaks, Jr | 20 | PA | Erie. |
| 4–Apr–03 | Army | Capt. Tristan N. Aitken | 31 | PA | State College. |
| 6–Apr–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Stevon A. Booker | 34 | PA | Apollo. |
| 30–May–03 | Army | Spc. Zachariah W. Long | 20 | PA | Milton. |
| 30–May–03 | Army | Spc. Michael T. Gleason | 25 | PA | Warren. |
| 1–Jul–03 | Army | 1st Sgt. Christopher D. Coffin | 51 | PA | Bethlehem. |
| 3–Jul–03 | Army | Pfc. Corey L. Small | 20 | PA | East Berlin. |
| 13–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Jaror C. Puello-Coronado | 36 | PA | Mount Pocono. |
| 28–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. William J. Maher III | 35 | PA | Yardley. |
| 12–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Timmy R. Brown, Jr | 21 | PA | Conway. |
| 17–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Craig S. Ivory | 26 | PA | Port Matilda. |
| 18–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Eric R. Hull | 23 | PA | Uniontown. |
| 27–Aug–03 | Army | Lt. Col. Anthony L. Sherman | 43 | PA | Pottstown. |
| 27–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Rafael L. Navea | 34 | PA | Pittsburgh. |
| 18–Sep–03 | Army | Capt. Brian R. Faunce | 28 | PA | Philadelphia. |
| 29–Sep–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Christopher E. Cutchall | 30 | PA | McConnellsburg. |
| 29–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. Andrew Joseph Baddick | 26 | PA | Jim Thorpe. |
| 13–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Douglas J. Weismantle | 28 | PA | Pittsburgh. |
| 18–Oct–03 | Army | 1st Lt. David R. Bernstein | 24 | PA | Phoenixville. |
| 1–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Maurice J. Johnson | 21 | PA | Levittown. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Ernest G. Bucklew | 33 | PA | Enon Valley. |
| 9–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Nicholas A. Tomko | 24 | PA | Pittsburgh. |
| 13–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Joseph Minucci II | 23 | PA | Richeyville. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Timothy L. Hayslett | 26 | PA | Newville. |
| 14–Dec–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Kimberly A. Voelz | 27 | PA | Carlisle. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Christopher A. Golby | 26 | PA | Johnstown. |
| 24–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. William R. Sturges, Jr | 24 | PA | Spring Church. |
| 9–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Edward W. Brabazon | 20 | PA | Philadelphia. |
| 19–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Clint Richard Matthews | 31 | PA | Bedford. |
| 20–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Matthew J. Sandri | 24 | PA | Shamokin. |
| 3–31–2004 | Army | Spc. Sean R. Mitchell | 24 | PA | Youngsville. |
| 4–3–2004 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Aric J. Barr | 22 | PA | Allegheny. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Jonathan R. Kephart | 21 | PA | Oil City. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Edward W. Carmen | 27 | PA | McKeesport. |
| 26–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Sherwood R. Baker | 30 | PA | Plymouth. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Martin W. Kondor | 20 | PA | York. |
| 3–May–04 | Marine | Gunnery Sgt. Ronald E. Baum | 38 | PA | Hollidaysburg. |
| 5–May–04 | Army | Pfc. Bradley G. Kritzer | 18 | PA | Irvona. |
| 16–May–04 | Army | Spc. Carl F. Curran | 22 | PA | Union City. |
| 16–May–04 | Army | Spc. Mark J. Kasecky | 20 | PA | McKees Rock. |
| 26–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. Richard P. Orengo | 32 | PR | Toa Alta. |
| 24–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Juan M. Serrano | 31 | PR | Manati. |
| 6–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Ramon Reyes Torres | 29 | PR | Caguas. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Joel Perez | 25 | PR | Rio Grande. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Frances M. Vega | 20 | PR | Fort Buchanan. |
| 4–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Francisco Martinez | 28 | PR | Humacao. |
| 5–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Jose A. Rivera | 34 | PR | Bayamon. |
| 7–Apr–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 3rd Class Fernando A. Mendezaceves | 27 | PR | Ponce. |
| 27–Aug–03 | Army | Sgt. Gregory A. Belanger | 24 | RI | Narragansett. |
| 1–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. Charles T. Caldwell | 38 | RI | North Providence. |
| 24–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Michael Andrade | 28 | RI | Bristol. |
| 27–Jan–04 | Army | Capt. Matthew J. August | 28 | RI | North Kingstown. |
| 4–5–2004 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Matthew K. Serio | 21 | RI | North Providence. |
| 4–4–2004 | Army | Sgt. Yihiyh L. Chen | 31 | Saipan | Marianas. |
| 5–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Farao K. Letufuga | 20 | Samoa | Pago Pago. |
| 27–Oct–03 | Army | Pvt. Jonathan I. Falaniko | 20 | Samoa | Pago Pago. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Pvt. Nolen R. Hutchings | 19 | SC | Boiling Springs. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Sgt. George Edward Buggs | 31 | SC | Barnwell. |
| 13–May–03 | Air Force | Staff Sgt. Patrick Lee Griffin, Jr | 31 | SC | Elgin. |
| 22–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. Orenthial J. Smith | 21 | Sc | Allendale. |
| 21–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Michael S. Adams | 20 | SC | Spartanburg. |
| 23–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Vorn J. Mack | 19 | SC | Orangeburg. |
| 18–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. Anthony O. Thompson | 26 | SC | Orangeburg. |
| 28–Oct–03 | Army | Pvt. Algernon Adams | 36 | SC | Aiken. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Darius T. Jennings | 22 | SC | Cordova. |
| 7–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Paul M. Neff II | 30 | SC | Fort Mill. |
| 13–Dec–03 | Army | Spc. Rian C. Ferguson | 22 | SC | Taylors. |
| 2–Jan–04 | Army | Capt. Kimberly N. Hampton | 27 | SC | Easley. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Maj. Michael B. Stack | 48 | SC | Lake City. |
| 29–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Esau G. Patterson, Jr | 25 | SC | Ridgeland. |
| 9–May–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer 2 Hans N. Gukeisen | 31 | SD | Lead. |
| 18–Jun–03 | Army | Pfc. Michael R. Deuel | 21 | SD | Nemo. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Scott A. Saboe | 33 | SD | Willow Lake. |
| 24–Dec–03 | Army | Capt. Christopher F. Soelzer | 26 | SD | Sturgis. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Cory W. Brooks | 32 | SD | Phillip. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Patrick R. Nixon | 21 | TN | Nashville. |
| 14–Apr–03 | Army | Spc. Thomas A. Foley III | 23 | TN | Dresden. |
| 9–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Roger D. Rowe | 54 | TN | Bon Aqua. |
| 5–Aug–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. David L. Loyd | 44 | TN | Jackson. |
| 20–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Kenneth W. Harris, Jr | 23 | TN | Charlotte. |
| 12–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class William M. Bennett | 35 | TN | Seymour. |
| 16–Oct–03 | Army | Lt. Col. Kim S. Orlando | 43 | TN | Clarksville. |
| 7–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Morgan D. Kennon | 23 | TN | Memphis. |
| 12–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Nathan J. Bailey | 46 | TN | Nashville. |
| 17–Nov–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Alexander S. Coulter | 35 | TN | Bristol. |
| 8–Jan–04 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Gregory B. Hicks | 35 | TN | Duff. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7–Apr–04 | Marine | Capt. Brent L. Morel | 27 | TN | Martin. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Don S. McMahan | 31 | TN | Nashville. |
| 24–Apr–04 | Navy | Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Christopher E. Watts | 28 | TN | Knoxville. |
| 2–May–04 | Army | Spc. Ervin Caradine, Jr | 33 | TN | Memphis. |
| 2–May–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Todd E. Nunes | 29 | TN | Chapel Hill. |
| 12–May–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Jeremiah E. Savage | 21 | TN | Livingston. |
| 15–May–04 | Air Force | Senior Airman Pedro I. Espaillat, Jr | 20 | TN | Columbia. |
| 20–Mar–03 | Marine | Cpl. Brian Matthew Kennedy | 25 | TX | Houston. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Johnny Villareal Mata | 35 | TX | Pecos. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Spc. James M. Kiehl | 22 | TX | Comfort. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Sgt. Edward J. Anguiano | 24 | TX | Brownsville. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Army | Pvt. Ruben Estrella-Soto | 18 | TX | El Paso. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Scott Jamar | 32 | TX | Granbury. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Master Sgt. George A. Fernandez | 36 | TX | El Paso. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Marine | Pfc. Chad E. Bales | 20 | TX | Coahoma. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Jesus Martin Antonio Medellin | 21 | TX | Fort Worth. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Air Force | Capt. Eric B. Das | 30 | TX | Amarillo. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Army | Pfc. Anthony S. Miller | 19 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 22–Apr–03 | Marine | Chief Warrant Officer Andrew Todd Arnold | 30 | TX | Spring. |
| 28–Apr–03 | Army | 1st Sgt. Joe J. Garza | 43 | TX | Robstown. |
| 28–May–03 | Army | Spc. Jose A. Perez III | 22 | TX | San Diego. |
| 16–Jun–03 | Army | Spc. Joseph D. Suell | 24 | TX | Lufkin. |
| 27–Jun–03 | Army | Pvt. Robert L. Frantz | 19 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 27–Jun–03 | Army | Cpl. Tomas Sotelo, Jr | 20 | TX | Houston. |
| 9–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Melissa Valles | 26 | TX | Eagle Pass. |
| 11–Jul–03 | Army | Spc. Christian C. Schulz | 20 | TX | Colleyville. |
| 19–Jul–03 | Army | Lt. Jonathan D. Rozier | 25 | TX | Katy. |
| 24–Jul–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Hector R. Perez | 40 | TX | Corpus Christi. |
| 26–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Daniel K. Methvin | 22 | TX | Belton. |
| 6–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Zeferino E. Colunga | 20 | TX | Bellville. |
| 11–Sep–03 | Army | Sgt. Henry Ybarra III | 32 | TX | Austin. |
| 18–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. James C. Wright | 27 | TX | Morgan. |
| 18–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Richard Arriaga | 20 | TX | Ganado. |
| 1–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Analaura Esparza Gutierrez | 21 | TX | Houston. |
| 9–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. Joseph C. Norquist | 26 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 13–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Stephen E. Wyatt | 19 | TX | Kilgore. |
| 22–Oct–03 | Army | Spc. John P. Johnson | 24 | TX | Houston. |
| 28–Oct–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael Paul Barrera | 26 | TX | Von Ormy. |
| 2–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Keelan L. Moss | 23 | TX | Houston. |
| 8–Nov–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Gary L. Collins | 32 | TX | Hardin. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. John W. Russell | 26 | TX | Portland. |
| 28–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Ariel Rico | 25 | TX | El Paso. |
| 2–Dec–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Clarence E. Boone | 50 | TX | Fort Worth. |
| 7–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Ray J. Hutchinson | 20 | TX | League City. |
| 22–Dec–03 | Army | Pfc. Stuart W. Moore | 21 | TX | Livingston. |
| 28–Dec–03 | Army | Pvt. Rey D. Cuervo | 24 | TX | Laguna Vista. |
| 28–Dec–03 | Army | Capt. Ernesto Blanco | 28 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 2–Jan–04 | Army | Eric T. Paliwoda | 28 | TX | Goodyear. |
| 16–Jan–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Roland L. Castro | 26 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 17–Jan–04 | Army | Spc. Larry E. Polley | ..... | TX | Center. |
| 18–Jan–04 | Army | Master Sgt. Kelly L. Hornbeck | 36 | TX | Fort Worth. |
| 21–Jan–04 | Army | Pfc. James D. Parker | 20 | TX | Bryan. |
| 23–Jan–04 | Army | Pfc. Ervin Dervishi | 21 | TX | Fort Worth. |
| 2–Feb–04 | Army | Pfc. Armando Soriano | 20 | TX | Houston. |
| 11–Mar–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Joe L. Dunigan, Jr | 37 | TX | Belton. |
| 18–Mar–04 | Marine | Pfc. Ricky A. Morris, Jr | 20 | TX | Lubbock. |
| 19–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Jason C. Ludlam | 22 | TX | Arlington. |
| 25–Mar–04 | Marine | LCpl. James A. Casper | 20 | TX | Coolidge. |
| 26–Mar–04 | Marine | Pfc. Leroy Sandoval, Jr | 21 | TX | Houston. |
| 31–Mar–04 | Army | 1st Lt. Doyle M. Hufstedler | 25 | TX | Abilene. |
| 31–Mar–04 | Army | Spc. Michael G. Karr, Jr | 23 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 1–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Dustin M. Sekula | 18 | TX | Edinburg. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Robert R. Arsiaga | 25 | TX | San Antonio. |
| 4–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Israel Garza | 25 | TX | Lubbock. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Gerardo Moreno | 23 | TX | Terrell. |
| 8–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Michael B. Wafford | 20 | TX | Spring. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Matthew E. Matula | 20 | TX | Spicewood. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Elias Torrez III | 21 | TX | Veribest. |
| 10–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Adolf C. Carballo | 20 | TX | Houston. |
| 10–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. William C. Eckhart | 25 | TX | Rocksprings. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Daniel R. Amaya | 22 | TX | Odessa. |
| 11–Apr–04 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer Wesley C. Fortenberry | 38 | TX | Woodville. |
| 14–Apr–04 | Army | Sgt. Christopher Ramirez | 34 | TX | McAllen. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Clayton W. Henson | 20 | TX | Stanton. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Ruben Valdez, Jr | 21 | TX | San Diego. |
| 26–Apr–04 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Aaron C. Austin | 21 | TX | Sunray. |
| 5–May–04 | Army | Cpl. Jeffrey G. Green | 20 | TX | Dallas. |
| 8–May–04 | Army | Spc. Isela Rubalcava | 25 | TX | El Paso. |
| 15–May–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Rene Ledesma | 34 | TX | Abilene. |
| 29–Mar–03 | Marine | Staff Sgt. James W. Cawley | 41 | UT | Roy. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Army | Staff Sgt. Nino D. Livaudais | 23 | UT | Ogden. |
| 17–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. Mason Douglas Whetstone | 30 | UT | Ogden. |
| 17–Nov–03 | Army | Capt. Nathan S. Dalley | 27 | UT | Kaysville. |
| 26–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. David J. Goldberg | 20 | UT | Layton. |
| 25–Mar–03 | Marine | Staff Sgt. Donald C. May, Jr | 31 | VA | Richmond. |
| 30–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Michael V. Lalush | 23 | VA | Troutville. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Capt. James F. Adamouski | 29 | VA | Springfield. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Army | 2nd Lt. Jeffrey J. Kaylor | 24 | VA | Clifton. |
| 7–Apr–03 | Air Force | Maj. William R. Watkins III | 37 | VA | Danville. |
| 13–Apr–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. David Edward Owens, Jr | 20 | VA | Winchester. |
| 4–May–03 | Army | Pvt. Jason L. Deibler | 20 | VA | Coeburn. |
| 8–Jun–03 | Army | Sgt. Michael E. Dooley | 23 | VA | Pulaski. |
| 1–Oct–03 | Army | Command Sgt. Maj. James D. Blankenbecler | 40 | VA | Alexandria. |
| 23–Oct–03 | Army | Capt. John R. Teal | 31 | VA | Mechanicsville. |
| 1–Nov–03 | Army | 1st Lt. Joshua C. Hurley | 24 | VA | Clifton Forge. |
| 5–Mar–04 | Navy | Petty Officer 2nd Class Michael J. Gray | 32 | VA | Richmond. |
| 14–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Frank K. Rivers, Jr | 23 | VA | Woodbridge. |
| 10–May–04 | Army | Pfc. Andrew L. Tuazon | 21 | VA | Chesapeake. |
| 16–May–04 | Army | 2nd Lt. Leonard M. Cowherd | 22 | VA | Culpeper. |
| 28–Apr–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Kendall Thomas | 36 | VI | St. Thomas. |
| 2–Apr–03 | Army | Chief Warrant Officer 4 Erik A. Halvorsen | 40 | VT | Bennington. |
| 3–Apr–03 | Marine | Cpl. Mark A. Evnin | 21 | VT | Burlington. |
| 6–Aug–03 | Army | Pvt. Kyle C. Gilbert | 20 | VT | Brattleboro. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | 1st Lt. Pierre Piche | 28 | VT | Starksboro. |
| 2–Jan–04 | Army | Solomon C. Gangayan | 24 | VT | Jay. |
| 9–May–03 | Marine | Lance Cpl. Cedric E. Bruns | 22 | WA | Vancouver. |
| 1–Aug–03 | Army | Spc. Justin W. Hebert | 20 | WA | Arlington. |
| 7–Aug–03 | Army | Pfc. Duane E. Longstreth | 19 | WA | Tacoma. |
| 6–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Kerry D. Scott | 21 | WA | Mount Vernon. |
| 1–Nov–03 | Army | 2nd Lt. Benjamin J. Colgan | 30 | WA | Kent. |

U.S. CASUALTIES IN IRAQ AS OF MAY 17, 2004—Continued

[Sorted by State of Residence]

| Date | Branch | Rank and name | Age | State | Hometown |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Robert T. Benson | 20 | WA | Spokane. |
| 17–Nov–03 | Army | Capt. James A. Shull | 32 | WA | Kirkland. |
| 28–Dec–03 | Army | Sgt. Curt E. Jordan | 25 | WA | Greenacres. |
| 25–Jan–04 | Army | Staff Sgt. Christopher Bunda | 29 | WA | Bremerton. |
| 16–Mar–04 | Army | First Lieutenant Michael R. Adams | 24 | WA | Seattle. |
| 28–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Jacob R. Herring | 21 | WA | Kirkland. |
| 12–May–04 | Army | Spc. Jeffrey R. Shaver | 26 | WA | Maple Valley. |
| 19–May–03 | Marine | Sgt. Kirk Allen Straseskie | 23 | WI | Beaver Dam. |
| 26–May–03 | Army | Maj. Mathew E. Schram | 36 | WI | Brookfield. |
| 9–Jul–03 | Army | Sgt. 1st Class Dan H. Gabrielson | 39 | WI | Spooner. |
| 22–Sep–03 | Army | Spc. Paul J. Sturino | 21 | WI | Rice Lake. |
| 26–Oct–03 | Army | Pfc. Rachel K. Bosveld | 19 | WI | Waupun. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Spc. Eugene A. Uhl III | 21 | WI | Amherst. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Sgt. Warren S. Hansen | 36 | WI | Clintonville. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | 2nd Lt. Jeremy L. Wolfe | 27 | WI | Menomonie. |
| 24–Dec–03 | Army | Maj. Christopher J. Splinter | 43 | WI | Platteville. |
| 16–Feb–04 | Army | Pfc. Nichole M. Frye | 19 | WI | Lena. |
| 10–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Bert. E. Hoyer | 23 | WI | Ellsworth. |
| 13–Mar–04 | Army | Capt. John F. Kurth | 31 | WI | Columbus. |
| 5–Apr–04 | Army | Pfc. Sean M. Schneider | 22 | WI | Janesville. |
| 29–Mar–04 | Marine | Cpl. Jesse L. Thiry | 23 | WI | Casco. |
| 6–Apr–04 | Marine | Pfc. Ryan M. Jerabek | 18 | WI | Oneida. |
| 9–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Michelle M. Witmer | 20 | WI | New Berlin. |
| 17–Apr–04 | Army | Spc. Michael A. McGlothin | 21 | WI | Milwaukee. |
| 15–Nov–03 | Army | Pfc. Rich Hafer | 21 | WV | Cross Lanes. |
| 1–Feb–04 | Army | Sgt. Roger C. Turner, Jr | 37 | WV | Parkersburg. |
| 18–Mar–04 | Army | Pfc. Ernest Harold Sutphin | 21 | WV | Parkersburg. |
| 30–Apr–04 | Marine | Cpl. Joshua S. Wilfong | 22 | WV | Walker. |
| 23–Mar–03 | Marine | Sgt. Brendon C. Reiss | 23 | WY | Natrona. |
| 14–Apr–03 | Army | Pfc. Joseph P. Mayek | 20 | WY | Rock Springs. |
| 30–Jul–03 | Army | 1st Lt. Leif E. Nott | 24 | WY | Cheyenne. |
| 25–Sep–03 | Army | Capt. Robert L. Lucero | 34 | WY | Casper. |

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is the unofficial start of summer: pools open, barbecues are held in local parks and in backyards, and families set out on car trips to take advantage of the long weekend. But the excitement of the beginning of summer should not obscure the holiday's true meaning—honoring the men and women who gave their lives in service of our country.

This weekend, the National World War II Memorial will be dedicated in Washington D.C. This memorial allows a grateful nation to thank the World War II generation for their selfless sacrifices, which helped preserve the freedoms we all enjoy. I am proud to join thousands of Americans around the country in honoring them. They exemplify the spirit, sacrifice, and commitment of the American people to securing freedom and democracy throughout the world. We are not just the beneficiaries of their bravery. We are the stewards of their sacrifice.

This Memorial Day, we have thousands of brave men and women fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. As we remember those who have fallen, we must continue to stand up for those who are still fighting overseas and those who have finished their service with honor. Our government must be accountable for the promises it makes to young men and women who are asked to serve our country in this way.

Military retirees—who served a career in uniform to defend our freedoms—are not asking for handouts; they are only asking for what was promised to them. I introduced the ''Keep Our Promises to America's Military Retirees Act,'' a bill to restore earned and promised health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services. Many people joined the military believing they would earn a lifetime medical care in exchange for 20 years of service, based on promises made by recruiters and government officials. We must now honor that promise. I am pleased that a majority of the House of Representatives has cosponsored the bill; now the House must act.

Another promise made to young men and women when they were recruited was that their surviving spouses would receive a fair pension upon retirement. However, the military's Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) unfairly slashes pension benefits for thousands of military spouses just when they need it the most. In response to this injustice, I co-sponsored the Military Survivor Benefits Improvement Act. This is fair legislation that would increase the minimum survivor benefit and restore to 55 percent from 35 percent the basic annuity for surviving spouses age 62 and older. I am pleased that this legislation recently passed the House.

I am also fighting to end the Disabled Veterans Tax, which forces disabled veterans and military retirees to give up one dollar of their pension for every dollar of disability pay they receive. I believe that our troops should be taken care of when we send them into battle and that they should be given our respect when we bring them home. Our brave men and women in uniform fought for our country. They shouldn't have to fight the government to get the benefits they deserve.

The National World War II Memorial will inspire future generations of Americans and stand as an important symbol of American national unity. It will serve as a timeless reminder of our solemn obligation to preserve peace for our children and the strength of our nation when united in a common and just cause.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, this Memorial Day we recognize again not only the soldiers who have died for their country over the generations—but also the men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am proud of our soldiers in Iraq who are serving their country with dedication and courage.

Four soldiers from Michigan's First District have made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq: Staff Sergeants Thomas W. Christensen and Stephen C. Hattamer who were killed on Christmas Day; Staff Sergeant Paul J. Johnson and Private First Class Jason G. Wright. I'd like to take a few minutes to describe these good men.

Sergeant Christensen, a 42-year-old from Atlantic Mine, was a reservist with the 652nd Engineer Battalion and had been overseas for about a year when he was killed. His brother described him as a quiet person who was handsome and smart. Sergeant Christensen had a passion for hunting and fishing and that is why he called the Upper Peninsula of Michigan his home.

Sergeant Hattamer, a 43-year-old from Gwinn, was a member of the same Battalion as Christensen and enjoyed weight lifting, waterskiing, and was famous for his chocolate cake using his mother's recipe. He is survived by his wife and three children. Sergeant Hattamer's love of country and children will live on through the scholarship the local community established in his honor.

Sergeant Johnson, a 29-year-old from Calumet, was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regimen of the famed 82nd Airborne. He was described as the epitome of a paratrooper and he is survived by his wife and son. He was from the ''Copper Country'' in the Keweenaw Peninsula.

Private Jason Wright, a 19-year-old from Luzerne, was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regimen of the famed 101st Airborne. Private Wright was a good student who played baseball, basketball and football in High School. He was protective of his three younger brothers and was truly devoted to his family. Jason Wright will be greatly missed by his family.

All four of these men served with honor and courage and my prayers are with their families. On this and every Memorial Day hereafter when we pause to honor our fallen soldiers, may God Bless their families and America.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, today we are setting aside a special time to pay tribute to fallen heroes. My South Texas district is mourning the loss of three such heroes, Pfc. Dustin Sekula, Sgt. Christopher Ramirez and Sgt. John Wayne Russell. These three men were very different. One was a fresh-faced 18-year-old who had only been in the Marines for 8 months. One was a 34-year-old veteran of the Gulf War and Kosovo who was looking forward to retiring and joining the Border Patrol. One was a 26-year-old, former high-school football player whose own hero was his 34-year Army veteran father. Yet all shared a love of country and a sense of patriotism and duty.

Sergeant Russell, a member of the Army's 101st Airborne was killed when his Blackhawk

helicopter collided with another helicopter on November 17, 2003 over Mosul, Iraq. Private Sekula, an infantry mortarman with the 2nd Battallion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, died April 1, 2004 from enemy fire in the Al Anbar Province of Iraq. Sergeant Ramirez, who served with the Army's 1st Infantry Division, 1st Battalion, 16th Infantry out of Ft. Riley, Kansas, was killed two weeks later on April 14 when his patrol was ambushed in Fallujah.

When you hear the stories that friends and families tell about Dustin, John and Christopher, you understand just how special all three were. They were role models to their peers, devoted sons, loyal friends and active in their communities. All could have chosen to use their talents in other career paths, yet they chose the path of military service.

Military service will not make you rich. It requires long absences from home and family, often in dangerous and inclement corners of the world. Yet Americans like Dustin, John and Christopher continue to volunteer to defend this country and protect our freedom, all the while knowing it may cost them their lives.

John, Christopher and Dustin are true heroes and we owe them more then we can ever repay. For their friends and families left behind, we offer our prayers and the comfort of knowing that the sacrifices of these young lives will not be forgotten. To those still on the front lines we pledge our unity and support. As we approach the Memorial Day holiday let us all take time away from the picnics and the sales to remember every fallen American hero.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to commemorate Memorial Day and remember all those who have proudly served our nation, I am pleased that we will finally dedicate the long-overdue World War II Memorial here in Washington, D.C. Now Congress should rededicate itself to improved services and benefits for our veterans and our troops and future veterans.

Since the fighting began in Iraq last year, nearly 800 American service men and women have died. It is my solemn privilege and honor to name the casualties from my district.

Specialist Joseph M. Blickenstaff, U.S. Army, Sergeant Travis A. Moothart, U.S. Army, Specialist Nathan W. Nakis, Oregon National Guard, Lance Corporal Gary F. VanLeuven, U.S. Marines, Specialist Chase R. Witham, U.S. Army.

In gratitude and in sorrow, I commemorate their courage and sacrifice. They chose to serve and served honorably and well. It is now our duty to keep these men in our hearts and in our memories as we celebrate the joy of living free and strong.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay tribute to the heroic men and women from the great state of Michigan who served in the United States Armed Forces and the civilian defense sector during World War II. The sacrifices that these heroes made to protect our country and defend freedom from the tyranny of totalitarianism will never be forgotten.

From Benton Harbor to Detroit, from Calumet to Monroe, brave men and women left behind their homes and loved ones to answer their country's call to duty. Be it fighting in the Atlantic or the Pacific theater or working in one of the many war production plants throughout our state, courageous Michiganders truly helped make America the Arsenal of Democracy. As our forces fight overseas today, like those of yesteryear, we are vividly reminded of the debt of gratitude we owe our men and women in uniform who serve to better our country.

Mr. Speaker, we come together as a people on Memorial Day to pay tribute and remember those who have died while defending our Nation and its values of democracy and freedom. This Memorial Day we make a special tribute to the Greatest Generation with the dedication of the National World War II Memorial. This Memorial is well overdue and will ensure that our nation will never forget the brave and gallant service of millions of Americans.

Today, we come together to praise and thank the many veterans who answered their country's call to serve. The labor of the mothers, fathers, sons and daughters of Michigan who helped defend our country shall never perish from our memory. For the National World War II Memorial stands tall to ensure that each passing generation understands the sacrifices that the World War II generation made for our nation.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, I want to pay special tribute to the thousands of men and women who gave their lives in defense of this nation even though they were never able to fully reap its vast benefits.

On January 29, 2004, the war on Iraq hit close to home as a young member of my constituency was killed. Private First Class Luis A. Moreno was a 19 year old Dominican-born immigrant who served in the Army's First Armored Division. He had been deployed in Iraq only three months before his untimely death.

What was most inspiring about this courageous young man was his willingness to fight for a country that had yet to grant him citizenship. Pfc. Moreno did not vote for the President who sent him into battle. So the question is why? Why did Pfc. Moreno and others like him, who could not enjoy the full benefits of this country, decide to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of it?

The fact that he took up arms may surprise some, but anyone who has a sense of America's past wars knows that this phenomenon has been ubiquitous throughout our history. During America's early wars, African Americans fought bravely for this nation even though they had not gained equal status in society. Many Japanese Americans courageously fought for this nation during World War II even as their families were placed into internment camps. I suspect that, much like the disenfranchised soldiers of those days, heroes like Pfc. Moreno continue to make these sacrifices because they believe in the promise of America; the promise of freedom and equality for all. It is this same promise that keeps immigrants coming to our shores from all parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor the countless men and women who have given their lives for this country, let us not forget that many of them fought and died even though they were never able to enjoy what they fought to preserve. It is too late for us to give rights to the thousands of Black soldiers who fought and died on the battlefields of World War II, or to allow Luis Moreno to vote in the next presidential election. But it is not too late for us to ensure that America fulfills its promise to those who continue to come to our shores in search of a better life.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, almost three years ago, our nation was shocked by the sickening reality of global terrorism infiltrating our borders. Since September 11, 2001, the global war on terror has resulted in the deployment of our troops to Afghanistan and other perilous locations. At the same time, more than 130,000 young Americans are serving in Iraq. During a time when the struggles of our troops abroad are broadcast every day, our observance of Memorial Day calls for sober reflection. We must remember that Memorial Day, at its core, is our nation's somber tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Seven hundred eighty-nine servicemen and servicewomen have lost their lives since the beginning of our combat operations in Iraq, and 85 have fallen in our military campaign in Afghanistan. Among these brave men and women is a constituent from my district, United States Army Specialist Rel Allen Ravago, IV, who was killed in Mosul, Iraq, on November 23, 2003. My heart goes out to Mr. Ravago's friends and loved ones, as it does to the innumerable Americans who have known troops whose lives were cut short during our nation's wars. It is with a sense of gratitude and humility that I will mark my observance of Memorial Day.

In the past few weeks, much attention has been focused on the conduct of our troops stationed in Iraq. Whether the grotesque abuses that have shocked us all are the result of the depraved actions of a few individuals or derelictions of duty rising up the chain of command is an issue that must be determined through Congressional investigation. Whatever the case may be, I am confident that Americans recognize that the overwhelming majority of our troops are honorable, deeply principled citizens. We are grateful to those who have left their families, jobs, and the comforts of home to fight threats to freedom and security.

We often find ourselves divided on the home front in terms of our views on both foreign and domestic issues. Pundits chatter on about red states and blue states in an attempt to highlight the supposedly irreconcilable political cleavages within our society. It is with this in mind that I reflect on the original observance of Memorial Day—then called Decoration Day—on May 30, 1868. On the inaugural celebration of what has become a national holiday, five thousand people journeyed to Arlington National Cemetery to decorate the graves of the more than 20,000 Union and Confederate soldiers buried there. Americans had heeded Abraham Lincoln's admonition to act ''with malice toward none, with charity for all'' and united to commemorate the fallen troops on both sides.

If our nation was then able to transcend a brutal conflict that pitted brother against brother, surely we can close ranks and join together now in mourning the men and women who have most recently died in Afghanistan and Iraq, and in other past battles. Memorializing our fallen troops is not a partisan or political issue; it is a basic debt of gratitude that all Americans owe to those who safeguard our freedom.

I hope all Americans will join us this Memorial Day in reflecting on those who safeguard our freedom, democracy, and prosperity.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today, I pay special tribute to Army Specialist Jason Christopher Ford who was killed on March 13, 2004

in Tikrit, Iraq. Army Specialist Ford epitomized the duty, valor and sacrifice that we honor in our members of the armed services.

Spc. Ford grew up in the Bladensburg, MD area. He was an optimistic young man who had an abiding love for his family. He was a good athlete—a swimmer, baseball player and avid bowler. Spc. Ford joined the U.S. Army in 2002 for the chance to travel. After completing basic training he was stationed in Germany and assigned to the 1st Battalion, 18th Infantry Regiment. In early March 2004 he was sent to Iraq. On March 13, 2004 while on patrol, an improvised explosive device exploded next to the Humvee Spc. Ford was riding in and he was killed.

Every day, the men and women of our armed services are exhibiting courage and making sacrifices ensuring that 25 million human beings who had been enslaved for a quarter of a century have been liberated. It is because of their courage and sacrifice that a dangerous dictator no longer menaces his own people or the world, but instead awaits the justice that he denied millions. And it is because of their courage and sacrifice that the universal aspirations of all men and women—freedom, democracy, and basic human rights—are being extended half a world away.

This generation of Americans, and future generations, are indeed blessed that when freedom's call came, brave Americans like Spc. Ford answered. We honor Spc. Ford's service to our country and his willingness to answer the call to duty. Today we say a special prayer for his family, friends and fellow soldiers. They must know that a grateful nation mourns their loss and shares their pain.

Daniel Webster, the noted orator, Member of Congress and Secretary of State, remarked nearly two centuries ago: ''God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it.'' Army Specialist Jason Ford was ready and he defended liberty. Today we remember and we pay our respect to a beloved son, brother, friend, and now a fallen American patriot who has made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation and the principles for which we stand—liberty, justice, equality and decency.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, and so it was said by Pericles, the Athenian leader some 24 centuries ago, ''Not only are they commemorated by columns and inscriptions, but there dwells also an unwritten memorial of them, graven not on stone but in the hearts of men.''

As Memorial Day 2004 approaches, I am awed by a greater sense of pride for our fallen soldiers and those serving aboard. We approach this day with solemn affirmations of the sacrifices of our brave men and women, and in celebration for every joy and freedom bestowed to us from the Almighty.

This day was born of human necessity and the answer to an overwhelming desire to honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice so that we may live without fear, but with hope. No matter where he has fallen, a soldier stands in place for you, for me, for us as a country and for freedom everywhere.

May they always be honored for their commitment and respected for their bravery. For the stance taken by each man and woman is written down in the archives of history. The stories and memories shape our vision of the world and provide footsteps for future generations.

Bow one head; lay one flower; remember one soldier; pray continuously; and may you be blessed this Memorial Day.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today, we honor the men and women in uniform who have lost their lives in military service to our nation. Memorial Day is for that reason a very solemn occasion. It is not a day to celebrate our military glories. Rather, we remember our losses: lost lives and the lost futures of our fallen soldiers. When the nation's political leaders commit our country's citizens to war, it is a concomitant that the lives of our soldiers are put at risk. Some will not come home alive and undamaged. Our leaders have an obligation to the citizens of the nation to know that and to take heed. My thoughts and prayers are with the families and loved ones of our fallen soldiers.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today, as the House of Representatives pauses for a moment of silence in honor of our fallen service men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, I rise in memory of Lieutenant Seth Dvorin, a member of the Army's 10th Mountain Division and a lifetime resident of East Brunswick, New Jersey.

An avid athlete, Seth played high school baseball and football before attending Rutgers University. In 2002, he joined the Army and was commissioned as an officer of the 10th Mountain Division's Battery B, 3rd Battalion, 62nd Air Defense Artillery Regiments.

Like many men and women in the armed forces and Reserves, Seth was deployed to Iraq. On February 4, 2004, he was killed when a device exploded on a road near Iskandariyah, Iraq. Seth died in the service of his country and his fellow soldiers. As a result of his bravery, others are alive today.

News of Seth's passing spread quickly throughout my Congressional district. Even those who never knew Seth personally still knew that we had lost someone special. Yesterday, more than two hundred students from John Witherspoon Middle School in Princeton gathered at Arlington National Cemetery to lay a wreath in honor of fallen service men and women. I was heartened to talk with these patriotic students today and understand the depth of their appreciation for the brave people who serve. Seth Dvorin was an American soldier and a respected member of our community. His loss is a tragedy—there is no other word.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that Seth's country appreciates and mourns the sacrifice he made on our behalf. Men of his character and courage are rare. New Jersey has lost one of its sons, and we will miss him.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 793 Americans who have given their lives and the 4,524 who've been wounded courageously serving their country in Iraq. It is fitting that we should share in a moment of silence on the floor of this House to honor their memory and sacrifice.

It is with particular sadness that I pay tribute to a Marine from my district whose service will not be forgotten. On Tuesday, April 6, 2004, Lance Cpl. Travis J. Layfield, a 19-year-old from Fremont, California, was killed during a firefight in the Anbar Province of Western Iraq. Travis served courageously through unimaginable circumstances. He is a credit to the US Marine Corps to which he was deeply dedicated.

A 2003 graduate of Washington High School, Travis is a hero for his service with the 2nd Battalion, 4th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force out of Camp Pendleton. Travis entered ROTC while in junior high school, committed to a career in the Marine Corps. Last year, he completed 12 weeks of basic training at the Marine Corps recruit depot in San Diego. He left for the Middle East in February 2003, first heading to Kuwait and later Iraq.

There has been tremendous outpouring of love and respect for Travis from his classmates and friends at his high school as well as from the entire Fremont community. We have joined together to mourn the loss of this proud young Marine. We shall long remember Lance Cpl. Travis J. Layfield. He gave his life for peace and democracy and died, as a noble Marine, serving our country.

Travis is but one example of the thousands of young Americans who answered the call of service and paid the ultimate price in Iraq. As a nation we mourn his passing and offer our solemn gratitude to him and to all those who have given life or limb for their selfless service and sacrifice to our country. Our thoughts are with Travis' family and the families of all those who have served and continue to serve courageously in our armed forces in Iraq.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on May 31st we will commemorate Memorial Day. Across our great land, thousands of American flags, proudly waving, will mark the final resting place of those who gave their lives so that we in the United States and people in other lands might enjoy the blessings of liberty. We are deeply saddened by their deaths, but eternally grateful for their sacrifice.

One such sacrifice in freedom's name was made on March 22, 2004, when a 20-year-old Marine Lance Corporal Andrew S. Dang's life was cut short in a gun battle during patrol near Ar Ramady, Iraq. Cpl. Dang was from Foster City, California, and he graduated from Aragon High School. Those who knew Andrew Dang best describe him as someone with a passion for science and technology who spent his free time building robots and rockets. He was one of the founding members of Aragon's renowned robotics team and by his senior year, he was taking multiple advanced placement classes in physics and chemistry. He also excelled in athletics as a wrestler and football player. The oldest of three brothers raised by a single mom, he joined the U.S. Marine Corps less than a year ago to make a better future for himself and to give back to his country. His life had just begun when bullets stole it away.

Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Memorial Day will be a difficult time for Cpl. Dang's family and friends, filled with vivid memories of a bright, enthusiastic and popular young man who will never come home. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to remember Mr. Dang and his fellow soldiers who served and made the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, world renowned anthropologist Margaret Mead once said, ''Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.'' These well articulated words embodies the core meaning of what Memorial Day symbolizes. If it was not for those individuals who banded together, many of us would not have the freedoms we enjoy today.

Citizens of Tennessee, the Volunteer State, have a long, storied history of military service

to our country. Many of its young have sacrificed themselves in the name of liberty, freedom, and patriotism. On courthouses and city halls across Tennessee, stone or bronze monuments list the names of the men and women who gave their life for this country. It is fitting that tribute be perpetually acknowledged to their ultimate sacrifice.

We must never lose touch with our traditions and history. Memorial Day is more than a three-day holiday weekend. It's about reconnecting with our past and being thankful for the freedom we all have today. We all must share in the loss of those brave patriots who have come and gone.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Lance Cpl. William W. White in recognition of his bravery, courage, and sacrifice for our country.

Lance Cpl. White, who grew up in Brooklyn, had been assigned to the 3rd Amphibious Assault Battalion, part of the 1st Marine Division, which is based in Camp Pendleton in California. On March 29, 2004, he became the first soldier from New York City to die in the Iraq war after his military Humvee rolled into a canal, and he drowned. He was 24 years old.

A 1998 graduate of Bushwick High School, White was committed to serving his country as he was planning to join the fire department or pursue a career in law enforcement upon his return. Until his final days, he always shared a great concern and love for others, especially his family. In his last letter home, he sent home a $100 bill to help his brother pay a cell phone tab, instructing him to keep the money if the brother had already paid the bill.

Lance Cpl. White was a disciplined student of martial arts and of the Bible. He left behind his wife Mychaele of 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, Lance Cpl. William W. White was a true American hero, making the ultimate sacrifice for our nation. As such, he is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Marine Sgt. Brian McGinnis of the Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 169, who made the ultimate sacrifice for his country on March 30, 2004 in southern Iraq. In the words of his fellow Marines, Sgt. McGinnis was a trusted mentor, a brother, and a hero.

Sgt. McGinnis, a graduate of William Penn High School and native of St. Georges, Delaware joined the Marine Corps because as he stated, he, ''wanted to be a part of the best.'' As a member of the U.S. Armed Services, Sgt. McGinnis had fulfilled his goal of becoming a part of the best fighting force in the world. Sgt. McGinnis had the opportunity to take part in activities he loved in the Marine Corps and had received his crew wings the day before he met with tragedy in southern Iraq. The most important aspect of Sgt. McGinnis' service in Iraq was the sense of pride he felt knowing that he was serving his country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to quantify the sense of loss our great Nation feels when faced with the loss of life of our men and women in the U.S. Armed Services. Nonetheless, I will say that Sgt. Brian McGinnis will be deeply missed by his family, his friends, the Marine Corps, and by his Nation. His service for our Nation and the service of countless men and women before and after him will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, I would like to rise in honor of a courageous young soldier who died September 7, 2003, of injuries suffered August 30 when the truck he was driving in a supply convoy was hit by a civilian vehicle in Iraq. U.S. Army Specialist Jarrett B. Thompson was a member of the Lewes, Delaware-based 946th Transportation Company, and sadly was our State's first war casualty from a Reserve or National Guard unit.

At only 27 years of age, Jarrett was a brave young reservist who valiantly served his state and country. A Dover resident who grew up in Millington, Maryland and played high school football, Jarrett joined the Army in March of 1994. Following a 3-year tour of active duty at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, he continued his commitment to service as a member of the Army Reserve. When he was called to active duty in January 2003, Jarrett dutifully accepted service in the Middle East, where his fellow reservists described him as an energetic, mission-oriented soldier.

In civilian life, Jarrett was a design engineer for Ashland Equipment, Inc. A proud son and devoted husband and father, Jarrett will be deeply missed by his parents, Judy Coleman Thompson and Allen B. Thompson, his wife Kelly, and their sons Conner and Collin. At his funeral in September, Jarrett received a 21-gun salute and the Bronze Star Medal in honor of his noble service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere privilege to honor the life of a proud soldier and heroic representative of the State of Delaware. Army Specialist Jarrett B. Thompson was an honorable defender of liberty, and he deserves our gratitude and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a brave young Army Ranger who died Thursday, April 3, 2003, due to suicide car-bomber at a checkpoint northwest of Baghdad. U.S. Army Specialist Ryan P. Long was a proud Ranger who gave his life, along with two of his fellow soldiers, helping the Third Battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment operate a checkpoint outside of Baghdad.

At only 21 years of age, Ryan was an inspirational young Delawarean who graduated from Seafood High School in June of 1999, where he had been vice commander of the Naval Junior ROTC program. Ryan joined the Army and became an Army Ranger, where he was part of an elite group chosen to carry out special missions. He was stationed in Fort Benning, Georgia and was deployed twice to Afghanistan before his service in Iraq, where he continued the noble fight against terror.

Ryan was a patriotic American who enjoyed soccer, golf, snowboarding, and motorcycles. Ryan was a fourth generation soldier, his father is retired Major Rudolf ''Rudy'' Long. Ryan followed in his family's tradition and chose to serve his country. He will be deeply missed by his parents, Rudy and Donna, and brother, his friends, teachers, and fellow soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere privilege to honor the life of a proud Ranger and heroic representative of the State of Delaware. Army Specialist Ryan P. Long deserves our gratitude and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the heroic life of U.S. Army Staff Sergeant Joseph Garyantes who died May 19, 2004, while securing freedom for the people of Iraq. Staff Sergeant Garyantes was patrolling Muqdadiyah, Iraq, just outside of Baghdad when his vehicle was attacked by sniper fire, ending the life of this dedicated soldier.

Staff Sergeant Garyantes was born in Wilmington, Delaware, and for most of his childhood called the Rehoboth Beach area home. He attended Epworth Christian School in Laurel, and at an early age contemplated a life in the Christian ministry. Eventually his selflessness and unwavering desire to help others drew him to military service. From what I have learned about this remarkable young man, it is apparent that Staff Sergeant Garyantes truly enjoyed helping others overcome the difficulties in their lives. For example, he wrote a letter to the editor while stationed in Germany, in response to a young soldier's complaint about the difficulties of Army life. His response was not negative or demeaning, he offered solutions and words of encouragement to this fellow soldier.

Staff Sergeant Garyantes, because of his inherent desire to lead and guide others to greatness, certainly would have found a way to inspire others in any career he chose, but he chose to join the U.S. Army. He chose to subject himself to the daily rigors of military service because he valued the well-being of others—ultimately at the cost of his own life. And although he will be missed tremendously by his wife and children, his family and friends, and his fellow soldiers, it is my hope that they can take comfort in his devotion to serving those in need, which will be his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I have the opportunity to honor the life of a true hero and American patriot such as Staff Sergeant Joseph Garyantes. His devotion to his fellow man is truly amazing, and he deserves our utmost respect and admiration.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay homage to all of our fallen heroes in arms that have defended our Nation from despotism, nazism, fascism, communism and terrorism.

The life we live has been shaped by those we honor today. Each answered Liberty's call to duty in defense of their country. Our Nation owes an immeasurable debt of gratitude for their service. Our humble words can never adequately put into perspective their overwhelming contribution to freedom.

We cannot forget the last full measure of devotion they gave us. Not for fame or fortune, but for a love of country, with determination, courage and honor, the men and women of our armed services have dedicated their lives to the defense of our democratic ideals.

We honor their memory. The freedoms we enjoy today because of their valor are their eternal legacy to us and our posterity.

I join a grateful nation in sending my thoughts and prayers to all the bereaved families who have lost loved ones who served to protect our sacred liberty.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 31, America will celebrate Memorial Day, our most solemn national holiday. First observed in 1868 to commemorate the Civil War dead, it was initially called Decoration Day. This tradition of placing flags on the graves of our war dead began at a time when our country still bore the scars of a four-year war that claimed 620,000 American lives, a war that divided America as nothing else has, before or since.

But as the House of Representatives pauses in 2004 to honor our Nation's fallen heroes, we do so as one Nation united by the values of liberty and democracy. When American families carry wreaths and flags to veterans' graves across the country, we do so as one America. When we visit the Garrison Forest Veterans Cemetery in Owings Mills, Arlington National Cemetery, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, or the new World War II Memorial on the Mall, our memories will be of those we knew and loved. And our thoughts and prayers will be with those still in combat today.

This year, while our military struggles to bring stability to Iraq, mounting American casualties cast new light on the meaning of valor and sacrifice. Nearly 800 American men and women have died in Iraq in the past fourteen months; yet on the faces of our soldiers, we see only their resolve, their unwavering dedication.

I want to make special mention of the 8 young Marylanders who have died in the Iraqi conflict: Private Brandon Davis, Specialist Jason Ford, Command Sergeant Major Cornell Gilmore, Captain Jason David Mileo, Specialist George A. Mitchell, First Lieutenant Adam G. Mooney, Sergeant Jeffery Walker, and Staff Sergeant Kendall Damon Waters-Bey. These brave men left the comfort and safety of our shores for Iraq, and theirs was the ultimate sacrifice. They are our heroes in the truest sense of the word. We extend our gratitude to them, we offer our condolences to their loved ones, and we hold them up as an example of America's best.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation prepares for the dedication of the National World War II Memorial next weekend, I rise to join my constituents in paying solemn tribute to the nearly 200 World War II veterans of Oscoda County, Michigan. Each and every one of these veterans deserves our continued gratitude for their service, for their sacrifice, and for their leadership.

On May 29th, the residents of Oscoda County will celebrate these members of the greatest generation with a parade, ceremony, and luncheon marking Oscoda World War II Veterans Recognition Day. This day has an added significance: Together they will also be watching the dedication ceremony in Washington, DC, for the National World War II Memorial. I am fortunate that I will have the honor of participating in this event, and will have the chance to thank these veterans in person for the sacrifice they made for our freedom 60 years ago.

I am especially pleased that this event is focused on those veterans that are still with us. On Memorial Day, our nation rightly honors those who made the ultimate sacrifice in the cause of preserving liberty. But we too often forget to thank those who came home to careers and family and civic leadership. By the grace of God they returned home, but this does not diminish their service and sacrifice. Indeed, their leadership and example since have put us further in their debt.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the World War II generation, and especially those who fought so bravely in Europe and the Pacific for the freedom we enjoy today, are deserving of our highest honor and deepest gratitude. We must never forget their sacrifice and their courage. I therefore ask that the House join me in paying tribute to that greatest generation, and especially to those who will be at the Oscoda World War II Veterans Recognition events.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the nearly 800 American soldiers who have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. No one has sacrificed more than these brave men and women and their families. The debt we owe them all is tremendous.

As we approach Memorial Day, we must never forget that people are dying as a result of the decisions of this House. Many of our brave soldiers will never again walk on this earth because of the choices we make.

Late last year I spent a week in Bethesda Naval Hospital recuperating from back surgery. During my stay there, I visited with wounded soldiers who had come home forever changed by the war in Iraq. Meeting with these soldiers and seeing their injuries gave me a firsthand look at the true reality of war, and made me more committed than ever before that our government cover all the expenses of any injury that results from war. But that's just not happening.

Congress must work to equip every soldier in Iraq and Afghanistan with the best equipment and supplies available, including state-of-the-art bulletproof vests, and Camelbak water bottles so they can rehydrate in the hot desert air. And the vehicles our soldiers use need to be equipped with the best and strongest armor available. Dozens of un-armored Humvees are falling victim to road-side bombs and rocket propelled grenades. This year's Defense Authorization bill paid for some of these things. It's about time.

We must make every attempt to provide for our service men and women when they come home from the war, too. That's why Congress needs to provide better health coverage to our veterans, and why we need to end the Disabled Veterans Tax immediately to ensure that anyone who has served in the military receives both health benefits and retirement benefits. This outdated tax from 1891 needs to go.

Our lives wouldn't be the same without the selflessness of thousands of courageous Americans. I am humbled by their courage and the sacrifices they have made for their country.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tremendous sacrifice and bravery of the countless men and women who have fallen in service to this great country. This Memorial Day, let us stop to remember all of the American service men and women who have answered the call to defend our Nation, many making that ultimate sacrifice for the peace and preservation of this great union.

As we prepare to dedicate the National World War II Memorial, we are again reminded of the brave, young men and women who have come before us giving their lives in defense of this land. From the beaches of Normandy to the Sea of Japan to the heart of the Rhine, 400,000 Americans gave their lives defending democracy and halting the spread of tyranny during the Second World War. Now, immortalized in granite, America pays tribute to our Greatest Generation and the selfless sacrifices so many made in honor of our Nation.

Again, this country is engaged in battle. Fighting to maintain peace and security across the globe, American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan continue to make the ultimate sacrifice to ensure freedom and democracy for all people. As the war on terror continues, Americans must honor the brave men and women who gave their lives for the protection of this Nation and the hope of another.

This Memorial Day I pay tribute to the millions of soldiers who have fallen in service to this great Nation and the immeasurable sacrifices they have made defending freedom and democracy throughout the world. It is with a humble heart and proud spirit that I honor the lives of America's fallen soldiers and remember with admiration their patriotism and dedication to country in the face of adversity. Let us never forget their sacrifices.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor those who have served our country so selflessly and given their lives to defend our freedom. We realize the sacrifice that these soldiers have made for our country can never truly be repaid, so we honor them by remembering their heroic deeds and what they have meant for America. Those who served and are presently serving in our military have helped defend our Nation from harm, allowing the citizens of my State of Maine and the citizens of our entire country to enjoy the liberties that we cherish so deeply.

Maine's population, as much as any State, has felt the burden of war for many years. With 154,000 veterans, a large percentage of Maine's small population has served and protected our country. Most Mainers have several relatives or friends who have defended our home. Our State's dedication to service continues as over 3,000 Maine citizens are putting their lives in harm's way overseas.

This Memorial Day is especially meaningful because we also remember those who have recently made the ultimate sacrifice for our country in a war where danger is still present today. Over 300,000 Americans have bravely faced the violence that still ravages Iraq and sadly over 700 servicemen and servicewomen have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Maine has not been immune from loss in this current conflict, and my thoughts are with the loved ones of those who gave their lives for our country. These sacrifices are fresh in our memory and should not and will not be forgotten.

Today we say thank you to those who gave their lives. Tomorrow we must make sure to honor their memory by caring for their families. We must forever recognize and respect the ultimate sacrifices that so many great men and women made so that the many citizens of our country can enjoy the blessings that they do today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Memorial Day, I rise today to pay tribute to the brave men and women who gallantly gave their lives so we may live in freedom.

Throughout the history of our nation, valiant soldiers have struggled, distinguished themselves, advanced our cause, and fallen in battle. Next weekend is the unveiling of a lasting tribute to our greatest generation—many of whom made the ultimate sacrifice more than 50 years ago.

As Tom Brokaw so eloquently wrote:

> They won the war; they saved the world. They came home to joyous and short-lived celebrations and immediately began the task of rebuilding their lives and the world they wanted.
>
> I am in awe of them, these men and women who have given us the world we have today. I feel privileged to have been witness to their stories. As I came to know many of them I

became more and more moved by their everyday excellence—and more and more convinced that this is the greatest generation in our country's history.

I too, am in awe of the brave men and women who fought on the front lines, and the millions of Americans who served on the home front. Truly they are the greatest generation.

Young men and women committed their lives, knowing they might not see their families again, for a cause that was greater than any individual nation. Young men and women committed to building a free world.

And now we mark the dedication of a memorial that honors our greatest generation, a memorial that will remind future generations of Americans as well as visitors from around the globe of the cost of freedom that we enjoy. It will serve as a reminder of the suffering and the sacrifice of our soldiers.

We also must take the time this Memorial Day to remember the soldiers who have given their lives in Operation Iraqi Freedom. These soldiers deserve no less awe and respect than those who fought and served more than 50 years ago. From Oregon, 15 brave soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice while serving their country: Specialist Brandon Scott Tobler of Portland, Sergeant Donald Walters of Salem, Captain Aaron Joseph Contreras of Sherwood, Staff Sergeant Robert Anthony Stever of Pendleton, Corporal Travis J. Bradachnall of Multnomah County, Chief Warrant Officer Erik C. Kesterson of Independence, Specialist Joseph M. Blickenstaff of Corvallis, Specialist Nathan W. Nakis of Corvallis, Specialist Christopher Jude Wesley of Portland, Sergeant Travis A. Moothart of Brownsville, Private 1st Class William C. Ramirez of Portland, Specialist Philip G. Rogers of Gresham, Lance Corporal Gary F. Van Leuven of Klamath Falls, Specialist Chase R. Whitman of Eugene, and Lance Corporal Bob W. Roberts of Newport.

Each of these 20 soldiers and their families deserve thanks from all Oregonians and all Americans. The Nation offers its collective thanks, as well as its sincere hope that all the Americans still in Iraq will return home to their families swiftly and safely.

Let us give thanks and praise to all men and women who worked together and in many cases died together, so that we all live in a more safe and more free world. We are all forever indebted to these brave soldiers.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous serviceman who lost his life while bravely serving our country in Iraq. Jason Ludlam made the ultimate sacrifice for his country and for the American people.

In times of war, our soldiers and their families carry the gravest imaginable burden upon their shoulders. The service these brave men and women provide their country is immeasurable and will not be forgotten.

I truly sympathize with the families of fallen heroes for their terrible loss. It is my hope that many good memories help bring these families comfort in their time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize and honor Jason Ludlam for the sacrifice he made and for the service he gave his country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous serviceman who lost his life while bravely serving our country in Iraq. Kenneth Melton made the ultimate sacrifice for his country and for the American people.

In times of war, our soldiers and their families carry the gravest imaginable burden upon their shoulders. The service these brave men and women provide their country is immeasurable and will not be forgotten.

I truly sympathize with the families of fallen heroes for their terrible loss. It is my hope that many good memories help bring these families comfort in their time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize and honor Kenneth Melton for the sacrifice he made and for the service he gave his country.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the brave men and women who have fallen in service in Iraq and Afghanistan. They gave the ultimate sacrifice to guarantee the freedoms and rights we hold so dear and to help the oppressed and give a voice to those who do not have one.

Army Sergeant Gregory Wahl, a constituent of mine from Valley Stream, NY, was one of the brave men who gave his life in Iraq. He was riding in a vehicle that flipped over in a canal during a combat patrol. Gregory, according to his father, wanted to be there and he knew what it was all about. He was confident in his mission and proud of his military career, which spanned over 11 years. Gregory is survived by his wife, Maricela, who together spent many hours enjoying their love of cooking, and his daughter, Alexis, who inherited her father's blue eyes. He loved his country and entered into combat with a lot of courage and ambition for his future, the future of Maricela and Alexis, and the future of the people he was fighting for, both Americans and Iraqis. But Gregory is only one of many. We have lost many brave men and women and it is important to remember their valor and dedication to our country.

I would also like to honor and extend my sorrow to the families of those who have fallen. While we get to go on with our daily lives, parents, spouses, and children will have to adapt and learn to live without their loved one. And for this they and the men and women of the Armed Forces will always be in my prayers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the well of the House of Representatives to honor those who have so nobly given their lives in defense of our freedoms and values. The men and women serving in the armed services both here and abroad are American heroes. We are holding this moment of silence today for our fellow countrymen and women that have given the last full measure of devotion in battlefields throughout the world. They will forever be remembered and revered in the memory of this great Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three brave soldiers from the 28th Congressional District of New York who lost their lives while serving in Iraq. These three men, all from Buffalo, left loving families, promising careers and secure futures to serve our Nation in the Armed Forces. They traveled thousands of miles across the world to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country. I am humbled to have served them in Congress.

Private First Class Tamario D. Burkett was killed in the line of duty just days after combat operations began in Iraq, on March 23, 2003. While securing bridges near Nasiriyah, Pfc. Burkett and his fellow soldiers came under heavy fire. Pfc. Burkett, who lived with his family on Peace Street, was just 21 years old. His family continues to celebrate his memory and to mourn the promise of his young life.

On October 17, 2003, Specialist Michael L. Williams was killed near Baghdad when the vehicle he was riding in ran over an explosive. Specialist Williams, 46, reenlisted in the Army National Guard after witnessing the horrendous attacks on September 11, which also happened to be his birthday. He died doing what he had dedicated his life to: protecting and serving the American people. He left behind a wife and four daughters.

Private First Class Charles E. Bush, Jr., was killed just days before Christmas on December 19, 2003, when a bomb exploded beneath his vehicle. Pfc. Bush, 34, was a cook in the Army, but he had volunteered as a door gunner to help protect the convoy. He could have stayed back, but he chose instead to ride along that day to defend his fellow soldiers. He left behind a devoted family and a young daughter.

This Memorial Day, we will pay respect to all the soldiers who have lost their lives defending our nation. It is a tragedy that across the nation, the legion of those we honor will now include hundreds of new names—names of fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, siblings and children who volunteered to serve their nation and who will never return home.

In Buffalo, this day will be especially tragic as we honor these three brave soldiers. Private First Class Tamario D. Burkett, Specialist Michael L. Williams and Private First Class Charles E. Bush, Jr. will forever be remembered for their patriotism, their valor and their sacrifice. I pray with all the families who have loved ones that no more lives will be lost and that all our soldiers will arrive safely home soon. We cannot stand to lose any more.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, General John Logan, the national commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, officially declared the first Memorial Day to be observed on May 30th, 1868. In a healing moment for our Nation, flowers were placed on the graves of both Union and Confederate soldiers at Arlington Cemetery. Our nation was united in our grief.

On this Memorial Day, 136 years later, we are again united in our grief and our respect for our fallen soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines. Whether speaking of those from the wars of our past or those from our current conflict in Iraq, we acknowledge their valiant service and sacrifice, as well as the void that their loss has left for their families, their communities, and our Nation. In my thoughts now, along with all of those whom we have lost, are six young men from my congressional district who have given their lives in Iraq:

Specialist Brandon Tobler, Corporal Travis Bradach-Nall, Specialist Christopher Rivera Wesley, Private First Class William Ramirez, Specialist Philip Rogers, Lance Corporal Bob W. Roberts.

There are no words that Congress can utter today that would be as noted as the silence of these soldiers. There is no way to express our appreciation and sorrow to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. We can only fulfill our duty to ensure that our men and women in uniform receive the best training and equipment, adequate pay and fair treatment during their service and after. We must then assure our veterans new and old, that they will receive the treatment they have been promised. Most importantly, we must

pledge our valiant and tireless effort for peace and security at home and abroad.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Memorial Day, 2004, we honor both the veterans who fought America's wars, and those who stand on the front lines of today's combat engagements.

Each day it seems, news from Iraq carries the awful news of combat deaths as we try to quell a nation and leave it in better hands than before. Most importantly, our troops are still pursuing al Queda and Osama bin Laden in the mountains of Afghanistan and elsewhere around the world to root out the entity that attacked us on 9–11. This generation's solemn mission is to undermine and eradicate the terrorist movement, which continues to grow and evolve, from the face of the Earth.

Today we honor all those who fought for this nation throughout our history. Americans all over the world are remembering friends, family members and countrymen who made the ultimate sacrifice for liberty and democracy. In South Texas, the list of young people lost in the global conflict with al Queda, and now in Iraq, is becoming longer than we can bear. We continue to welcome home other sons and daughters who were injured or captured. Please remember these brave young warriors and their families on this Memorial Day.

As a member of Congress who sits on the House Armed Services Committee, I know what we ask of people in uniform, and I know the difficulties of service. As a veteran, I know what is expected of soldiers and sailors in combat—or in the possibility of combat. The very least we must do for the men and women who serve this nation is provide adequately for their health care now and in their later years.

The attack on our nation on 9–11 served to remind us that firemen, law enforcement officers and doctors also stand on the front lines in the first war of the 21st Century. The world has entered this century through pillars of fire, and the United States is called to fight a global war again, this time against al Queda and the terrorism they sponsor and continue to inspire. Americans, as always, fight for this country, and South Texans always make an extraordinary contribution to our military force.

Today, let us pledge anew to face the challenges of our world with compassion, strength, and understanding as we stand on the watchtower of freedom. On this Memorial Day, let us remember the heroes of our history as we wish for peace as the poets and the dreamers do—but remain ever ready to fight the battles that are righteous, where the values of freedom and democracy are at stake.

Please take a moment of silence and remember the South Texas heroes who answered this nation's call to military service, especially those who gave this nation the ultimate measure of devotion. We remember them all and their families today and always. Our South Texas heroes:

Killed aboard the USS *Cole*: Petty Officer 3rd Class Ronchester Santiago, 22, from Kingsville and Fireman Gary Swenchonis Jr., 26 from Rockport, TX

Army Spc. Edward J. Anguiano, 24, from Los Fresnos, 3rd Combat Support Battalion from Los Fresnos; he went missing on March 23, 2003, when his convoy was ambushed in Iraq; his remains were recovered on April 24

1st Sgt. Joe J. Garza, 43, 1st Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division, from Robstown; he was killed on April 28, 2003, when he was struck by a civilian vehicle in Iraq

Pfc. Juan Guadalupe Garza Jr., 20, 1st Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division from San Benito; he was killed in action on April 8, 2003, in central Iraq

Staff Sgt. Hector R. Perez, 40, 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) from Corpus Christi; he was killed when his military convoy came under fire north of Hawd, Iraq on July 24, 2003

Spc. Jose A. Perez III, 22, 6th Battalion, 27th Field Artillery Regiment, 18th Field Artillery Brigade, from San Diego, Texas; he was killed in an ambush of a convoy on May 28, 2003, in Taji, Iraq

Sgt. Christopher Ramirez, 34, 1st Battalion, 16th Infantry, 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, from McAllen; he died from injuries sustained during combat operations in Al Anbar Province, Iraq, on April 14, 2004

Sgt. John W. Russell, 26, 4th Battalion, 101st Aviation Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), from Portland; he was killed when two 101st Airborne Division UH–60 Black Hawk helicopters collided in midair over Mosul, Iraq, on November 15, 2003

Pfc. Dustin M. Sekula, 18, 2nd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, from Edinburg; he died due to injuries sustained from enemy fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq, on April 1, 2004

Lance Cpl. Ruben Valdez Jr., 21, 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, from San Diego; he died from combat injuries in Al Anbar Province, Iraq, on April 17, 2004

May the Lord bless their souls, and make strong their families, who must live forever without them. And may this list grow no longer . . .

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the upcoming Memorial Day holiday.

This Memorial Day is particularly poignant as hundreds of thousands of brave American service men and women are serving their country and putting their lives on the line in Iraq, Afghanistan and around the world.

Our service men and women—including many from my community on the Central Coast of California—have left their homes, jobs, and families to serve in Afghanistan and Iraq.

While we honor those who are currently serving and pray for their safe return home, today we remember and pay tribute to the Americans who have fought and given their lives for us, from Lexington and Concord to the beaches of Normandy, the jungles of Vietnam, the mountains of Afghanistan, and the desert of Iraq.

Every casualty on the battlefield is a blow to our nation, but we are mindful that it is an unspeakable loss to the family and friends of the one who has been lost.

We know too that the qualities embodied by our fallen soldiers—heroism, honor, bravery, and sacrifice—cannot always be of great comfort to those who knew them best.

My thoughts and prayers are especially with the loved ones of fallen soldiers who hail from Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura Counties on California's Central Coast.

The very least the Federal government can do for those who did their duty and served our nation is to provide them quality health care and retirement benefits. This is our duty.

Today, we pause and remember those who have died to preserve American values. We honor those who fought, and who fight today to protect American freedoms.

I will do everything I can to keep our troops safe and to preserve the quality of life of our veterans. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this endeavor.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our fallen heroes and to pay tribute to our current military men and women who are serving our Nation in a time of war. I especially want to thank American Samoa's warriors for the sacrifices they have made so that you and I and future generations may live in peace.

American Samoa's sons and daughters have served in record number in every U.S. military engagement from WWII to present operations in our war against terrorism. Our active duty service members are also serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. In March of this year, over 65 soldiers from American Samoa's Army Reserve Unit were deployed to Iraq and recently we received word that other units from American Samoa will soon follow.

Last year, American Samoa lost two young warriors to the war in Iraq. In August 2003, SPC Farao Kevin Letufuga died in Mosul, Iraq and it was with heavy hearts that CSM Iuniasolua Savusa and I accompanied his body home. Specialist Letufuga served as a member of the 101st Airborne Division. He is the son of Mr. Fetineia'i and Siniva Letufuga of Aoloau, American Samoa.

On October 27, 2003, PVT Jonathan I. Falaniko was killed in Baghdad, Iraq in a rocket propelled grenade attack. Twenty-year-old Jonathan Falaniko had been in the U.S. Army for less than 6 months. He attended basic training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, in May 2003 and was deployed to Iraq in August 2003. Private Falaniko was then assigned to the 70th Engineer Battalion under the 1st Armored Division, Engineers Brigade of which his father, Ioakimo Falaniko, was the command sergeant major and the most senior enlisted soldier.

CSM Ioakimo Falaniko has been serving with distinction in the U.S. Army for over 26 years and is still serving in Iraq. Command Sergeant Major Falaniko is from the village of Amanave, American Samoa and his wife Maliana is from Aua. Their son was laid to rest at the National Cemetery in Arlington on Friday, November 7, 2003. I was privileged to be invited by the Falaniko family to speak at Private Falaniko's services. It was a very solemn and inspiring service that was also attended by LTG Robert Flowers, Commander of the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Sergeant Major of the Army, Jack Tilley.

In Samoan culture, it is customary to make speeches so that for generations to come the name of our fallen heroes will not be forgotten. This is why I am pleased that we are observing a moment of silence today and are reserving a special section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Members to honor fallen soldiers from their districts and to offer their thoughts on Memorial Day. In remembrance of Specialist Letufuga and Private Falaniko, I rise today to say that these two young men lived and died honorably as true Samoan warriors. They gave their lives so that you and I may live in freedom.

Across America, many others have also died while protecting our Nation and today I pay special tribute to them. To those who

have lost their sons and daughters and husbands and wives, I say let us honor their patriotism, love of country and willingness to serve and sacrifice to bring about peace and freedom in a troubled world.

To our veterans and current service members, and especially to American Samoa's Reserve unit now serving in Iraq, I would like to close by saying I am proud of you. As a Vietnam Veteran, I commend you for your courage and I thank you for your service to our country. May God bless you and may God bless America.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of our Nation's Armed Forces who are performing so magnificently in Iraq, under very difficult circumstances. America is exceedingly blessed to have such citizens who are willing to put their lives on the line to protect our Nation.

Some who serve in Iraq have made the supreme sacrifice by giving their very lives in defense of our Nation. And to those heroes we owe our eternal gratitude, and we give our deepest sympathy to their families and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, several families in my congressional district have lost loved ones in Iraq. I list their names and hometowns for my colleagues in Congress.

SGT Michael F. Pedersen, U.S. Army of Flint, MI, killed in action in a helicopter crash on April 2, 2003.

SSG Scott Sather, U.S. Air Force of Clio, MI, killed in action on April 8, 2003.

PFC Jason M. Meyer, U.S. Army or Swartz Creek, MI, killed in action when struck by mortar fire on April 8, 2003.

SSG Brett J. Petriken, U.S. Army of Mundy Township, MI, killed in action escorting a convoy on May 26, 2003.

SPC Artimus D. Brassfield, U.S. Army of Flint, MI, killed in action when struck by mortar fire on October 24, 2003.

SPC Richard K. Trevithick, U.S. Army of Gaines, MI, killed in action by an improvised explosive device on April 14, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to observe Memorial Day later this month, it is incumbent upon us to remember the service and sacrifice of, not only those who have fought in previous wars and conflicts, but also the fine men and women who are currently serving our Nation in Iraq, Afghanistan and around the world. We particularly want to express our gratitude to those heroes who have given their lives in the service of our country. May they rest in peace.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, we come together, as we do every year, to observe this national day of remembrance—to honor the men and women who've given their lives in the service of our country.

This year we sadly add the names of 19 sons and daughters of Wisconsin, killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, to those rolls. We join with their families in grieving the loss of: SPC Bert Hoyer, PVC Nicholas Frye, MAJ Christopher Splinter, SGT Warren Hansen, SPC Eugene Uhl III, 2nd LT Jeremy Wolf, PFC Rachel Bosveld, SPC Paul Sturino, SGT Dan Gabrielson, MAJ Mathew Schram, SGT Kirk Straseskie, CPT John Kurth, PFC Sean Schneider, CPL Jesse Thiry, PFC Ryan Jerabek, SPC Michelle Witmer, SPC Michael McGlothin, PO Michael Anderson, and SPC Robert Cook.

We mourn them as we mourn the loss of all Americans in uniform who've made the ultimate sacrifice.

This is a day of great pride and great sorrow. It is a day of sweet memories and bitter regrets. It is a day of despair and, yet, of hopefulness.

Yes, despite our sadness, we do have reason to be hopeful.

For as long as men and women don the uniform and serve with distinction, they embody the promise of America. This America founded on the principles of equal justice under law. This America which for centuries has stood as a beacon of liberty. This America which, by the sacrifices of those we honor today, we still proudly proclaim the land of the free and the home of the brave. We remember them today and always.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the young men and women who have given their lives while serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan.

A monument now stands in our Nation's capital to recognize the service and sacrifice of our service men and women during World War II. The long-overdue monument comes at a time when our Nation is reminded each day of the painful reality of war—not everyone returns home. The 2nd Congressional District of Washington state that I represent has not stayed immune from this reality.

This coming Memorial Day I will join with veterans of wars past to honor those who did not return home—including the four young men from the 2nd District who gave their lives for this nation during Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

On Memorial Day, today, and every day, I honor Air Force Staff Sergeant Juan M. Ridout of Oak Harbor, Washington; Army Private First Class Kerry D. Scott of Concrete, Washington; Army Specialist Justin W. Hebert of Silvana, Washington; and Army Specialist Nathan W. Nakis of Sedro-Woolley, Washington.

You will not be forgotten.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to dedicate the World War II Memorial in Washington DC next week, and remember the sacrifices of the Greatest Generation who repelled the forces of tyranny and hate in Europe and the Pacific 50 years ago, let us also pause to honor a new generation of brave Americans that have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. We observe a moment of silence for those brave young men and women that have given their life while serving our Nation in the War on Terror.

Throughout the history of this Nation, the soldiers of our Armed Forces have fought to preserve the ideals of democracy, freedom, and liberty. The tragic events of September 11th, 2001, reminded us that there is no permanent respite from the need to maintain our guard in an unstable world. Even as Communism and the Cold War have faded into history's mists, radical and dangerous new groups and individuals are ready to rise to test the willingness of America to defend itself. The sacrifices of our sons and daughters fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq demonstrate that when duty calls, America is ready. Hundreds of thousands of men and women in uniform have bravely answered the call to duty and traveled far beyond our borders to preserve and protect our nation in its time of need. Our Armed Forces are working today throughout the globe to ensure that future generations of Americans can live in a free and peaceful society.

Today, we pause to remember our young men and women who answered the call, fought bravely, and sacrificed much to preserve our freedom. It is with a heavy but grateful heart that we thank our fallen soldiers and their families in these difficult times. We can never fully repay their service, but we must never forget their sacrifice.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Memorial Day, I rise to recognize a fallen soldier from my district, First Lieutenant David R. Bernstein, formerly of Phoenixville, Pennsylvania.

Lieutenant Bernstein, 24 at the time of his death, was a member of the 1st Battalion (Airborne), 508th Infantry Regiment, 173rd Infantry Brigade of Camp Ederle, Italy. He, along with Pfc. John D. Hart, 20, of Bedford, Mass., were killed in Taza, Iraq on October 18, 2003 when enemy forces ambushed their patrol using rock-propelled grenades and small arms fire.

Although I never had the opportunity to know Lieutenant Bernstein, what I have read about his life demonstrates what a tremendous and exemplary young man he was. He was a member of the West Point swim team for his 4 years at the United States Military Academy and enjoyed running, bicycling and competing in triathlons. He was also an accomplished student as exhibited by his selection as his high school valedictorian at Phoenixville High School and finishing fifth in his class at West Point. Lieutenant Bernstein, like so many fallen soldiers throughout our history, looked forward to a bright future, but sacrificed that future for the welfare, safety and liberty of our Nation.

I take this opportunity today to thank Lieutenant David R. Bernstein for his heroic service and sacrifice to our Nation and to also offer my condolences to his parents, Richard and Gail, and the entire Bernstein family.

Mr. Speaker, on this Memorial Day, I will remember First Lieutenant David R. Bernstein as an example of the sacrifices made by so many to keep our Nation strong and free. I ask my colleagues and the public to join me in remembering and honoring our Nation's fallen heroes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the courageous servicemen and women who have given their lives to protect us in this time of war. These selfless warriors have dedicated their lives to fighting for this great country and our freedoms, and it is only fitting that we honor them this Memorial Day.

As President John F. Kennedy once said, "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind." Although we are forced with the difficult decision of sending our servicemen and women into the battlefield, it is they who make the conscious decision to leave their families and friends behind. Every day of every month, these valiant members of our armed forces make the call to duty—always aware of the challenges they face and the painful reality that they may not make it back home. Yet, they still make the admirable choice, and they do it honorably and without complaint. Our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen and women are the true heroes and heroines in this world, and they are the ones who will help to bring an end to war.

As we observe this Memorial Day, our hearts will be filled with gratitude to the brave men and women in uniform who have laid down their lives for this great country. And, the voices of those who have fallen will echo in

our memories as we are comforted by the legacy of courage that they have established for us. We must all remember that freedom, and the blessings it brings, often exacts the ultimate sacrifice. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I stand today to pay tribute to the remarkable servicemen and women who have lost their lives so that we may continue ours. They have proudly served our country, and now we proudly recognize and honor them. May God's grace be upon each and every one of them.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 136th observance of Memorial Day, the House of Representatives paused in a moment of silence to honor all of our fallen heroes. Men and women across the United States and from other countries continue to serve in the defense of our great nation and the ideals we hold most important. These brave heroes are prepared to make this same sacrifice should their duties require it, and that is a grave responsibility we must honor.

This year I also want to recognize an unsung group of fallen military heroes, the countless members of our Armed Forces that served and died for our country but were never United States citizens. Many American military heroes, past and present, were born outside of the United States. From the thousands of non-citizens who fought for our independence as a nation, to those who fought for the Union Army during the Civil War, to the more than 36,000 non-citizen members of today's Armed Forces, these men and women have sacrificed for our country and the preservation of our precious freedom. We succeeded today in amending the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization Act to authorize creation of a memorial to recognize these fallen heroes at Arlington National Cemetery, our nation's premier military cemetery and shrine honoring the men and women who served in the Armed Forces.

As a combat veteran and member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I am keenly aware and appreciative of the sacrifices our service members make. In the past, I received the good will and recognition of this nation for my service. This Memorial Day, I want to extend these sentiments to our service members, my fellow veterans, and our fallen heroes from the United States and allies nations around the world.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three young men from my district who sacrificed their lives while serving in the Armed Forces in the war on terror.

Jason Plite of Delta Township, Eaton County, Michigan, was a senior airman in the Air Force who died while on a mission to rescue two injured Afghan children. He was an extraordinary young man who took part in an elite Special Forces program to become an airborne paramedic and was serving his second tour in Afghanistan. Jason was both artistic and athletic, serving as captain of his high school swim team and painting murals for local businesses. A sensitive individual who loved his country, his family and his friends, Jason was always there when someone needed him. He was 21 years old.

D.J. Wheeler of Concord, Michigan, died in Tikrit while serving as gunner on an armored vehicle that was attacked with a rocket-propelled grenade. D.J., whose nickname was ''Sunshine'', enlisted right after the 9/11 attacks. He delighted in handing out dollar bills and candy to Iraqi children and was known for his sense of humor and generous spirit. While attending Lumen Christi High School he played offensive lineman on the football team. In spite of his towering height, he was gentle and loving with friends and family. He was 22 years old.

Bradley Fox of Adrian, Michigan, was an Army gunner in Iraq. He enlisted at age 19, serving in the first Gulf War, Kosovo, Panama and Afghanistan. He was severely wounded when his Bradley Fighting Vehicle was hit by a roadside bomb and he was evacuated to Germany for treatment. Brad was on life-support for a month before he succumbed to his injuries with his wife at his side. His fellow soldiers told his mother, his wife, and children how proud they were to have served with him and what a dedicated leader he had been. Working on his master's degree, he was planning to teach after he completed 20 years in the Army. He was 35 years old.

My tribute to these young men should be measured by showing that they did not strive and die in vain, but that through their sacrifice, future generations can live in greater peace, prosperity, and hope.

Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to all the many men and women who have died in defense of our nation. Next week is Memorial Day where we join our constituents in honoring those who gave their lives to ensure that we enjoy the principles of liberty, justice, and democracy. During that time, we remember, honor, and reflect on the men and women who paid the ultimate price for their country. Flags fly at half-mast, relatives and friends place wreaths and flowers on the graves of those they loved, and communities host parades adorned in red, white, and blue. These tributes are small tokens we perform in an effort to convey our gratitude to those who have served for the cause of freedom and democracy.

Over this last year, my district alone has lost three soldiers: Pfc. Matthew Bush, Spc. William Dusenbery, and Capt. John Tipton. Further, in my district, Jack Montague, a civilian KBR employee for the Halliburton Corporation, died while working in Iraq. Today and throughout this Memorial Day week, we honor their memories and their families who bear the heaviest burden of our freedom. They are not simply statistics; these fallen soldiers were dads, brothers, sons, neighbors, and community leaders. While the grief and pain may not have faded, I hope it is comforting for them to know that their fallen heroes are loved, honored, respected and their cause was just.

In addition, let us remember that thousands of servicemembers will spend this Memorial Day stationed in other countries defending our freedoms far away from their families. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in a moment of silence to remember our fallen soldiers and pray for peace.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the United States, men and women have paid the ultimate price for freedom.

Memorial Day is a day dedicated to the remembrance of those who gave their life in the name of freedom.

The U.S. House of Representatives has assembled in the Capitol to pay special tribute to those who have lost their life in the war against terrorism. Henceforth, the battle has been in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I salute those from Georgia who have died on the battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan:

U.S. Army Specialist Jamaal R. Addison of Roswell.

U.S. Army Private First Class Diego Fernando Rincon of Conyers.

U.S. Army Private First Class Michael Russell Creighton Weldon of Conyers.

U.S. Army Captain Edward J. Korn of Savannah.

U.S. Army Specialist David T. Nutt of Blackshear.

U.S. Army Specialist John K. Klinesmith of Stockbridge.

U.S. Army Sgt. Michael T. Crockett of Soperton.

U.S. Army Sgt. Nathaniel Hart Jr. of Valdosta.

U.S. Army Staff Sgt. Bobby C. Franklin of Mineral Bluff.

U.S. Army Private Benjamin L. Freeman of Valdosta.

U.S. Army Command Sgt. Major Jerry L. Wilson of Thomson.

U.S. Army Specialist Marshall Edgerton of Rocky Face.

U.S. Army Specialist Christopher J. Holland of Brunswick.

U.S. Army Specialist Nathaniel H. Johnson of Augusta.

U.S. Army Staff Sgt. Ricky L. Crockett of Broxton.

U.S. Army Sgt. William J. Normandy of Augusta.

U.S. Army Master Sgt. Thomas R. Thigpen, Sr. of Augusta.

U.S. Army Specialist William R. Strange of Adrian.

U.S. Air Force Airman 1st Class Antoine J. Holt of Kennesaw.

U.S. Army Private First Class Marquis A. Whitaker of Columbus.

U.S. Army Specialist Justin W. Johnson of Rome.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, as the House pauses to remember all the brave American men and women of our Armed Forces who have been lost in Iraq and Afghanistan, I am proud to honor the service and sacrifice of Sgt. Thomas Robbins, who grew up in New York's Capital Region.

Sgt. Robbins, a cavalry scout with the Army Stryker Brigade's 1st Squadron, 14th Cavalry Regiment out of Fort Lewis, Washington, lost his life this February due to injuries sustained in northwestern Iraq.

Sgt. Robbins is survived by his wife, Gina, their beautiful daughter, Marisa, his father, Douglas, and mother, Charlene.

I know the pain of such a tremendous loss. In August of 1970, I was called to my home in Green Island, New York, to learn that my brother Bill had been killed in Vietnam. H.M.3 William F. McNulty, a medic in the Navy, transferred to the Marine Corps, had been out in the field in Quang Nam province patching up his buddies when he stepped on a land mine and lost his life. Our family misses him every day.

On this Memorial Day, Mr. Speaker, I also recall the service of my Dad, Jack McNulty, and friends like Leo O'Brien, Lou DiNuzzo, Peter D'Alessandro, and other World War II veterans who were part of what we now call ''the greatest generation.'' We can all be very proud of the beautiful new World War II Memorial on the National Mall. This monument will stand for generations in honor of those who put their lives on the line for all of us, for our families, and for all that we hold dear.

On a daily basis, we should remember that had it not been for all of the men and women who wore the uniform of the United States military through the years, like my good friend Ned Haggerty, who earned two Purple Hearts in Korea, the rest of us would not have the ability to boast that we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the Earth. Freedom isn't free. We have paid a tremendous price for it. Let us never forget that.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans are the reason why, when I get up each morning, I thank God for my life—and veterans for my way of life.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, southwest Missouri learned early in the War on Terrorism of the sacrifices necessary to defend our way of life. Two men from the 7th Congressional District died in less than a week of hostilities in Afghanistan.

Stanley L. Harriman, 34, a Chief Warrant Officer in the United States Army, was the first American killed in combat in Afghanistan on March 2, 2002. His death brought the harsh realities of war home to the Ozarks. Harriman was assigned to the 3rd Special Forces Group at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. While Harriman's hometown is Wade, North Carolina, he had family ties to Southwest Missouri. He attended and graduated from Strafford High School in 1985. ''Stanley died for you and you and you,'' his wife, Sheila Harriman, told reporters at Fort Bragg, N.C., ''and for your freedom. All Stanley ever wanted to do was be an American soldier.''

Two days later, Army Sergeant Philip Svitak of Joplin was killed in action. Svitak was killed by friendly fire while in combat with Taliban and al Qaeda forces in eastern Afghanistan during Operation Anaconda on March 4, 2002. Svitak was 31. He was assigned to the 160th Special Operations Group at Ft. Campbell, Kentucky. His wife and two children survived him. He was the only son in a family of veterans. Both his mother and father served in Vietnam. Roseann Svitak said her son ''told me before he went, 'Mom, the terrorists have to be stopped.' He said, 'If they send me over there and anything happens to me . . . I'm proud to die for my country.' ''

Daniel Kisling, Jr. of Neosho died of injuries suffered in a helicopter crash in Afghanistan on January 30, 2003. Kisling and three other servicemen were aboard a UH–60 Black Hawk helicopter that crashed during a training exercise. Staff Sergeant Daniel Kisling, Jr. served in the U.S. Army for eight years. At the time of the fatal crash he was assigned to the 101st Airborne Division based at Ft. Campbell, Kentucky. He was the crew chief aboard the Black Hawk helicopter. Daniel Kisling was survived by his parents Daniel Leon and Velinda Kisling of Neosho, Missouri, and his sister Lisa. Kisling was married to Georgie McNeill for 14 years. They have three children: Nathan, age 13; Jessie, age 10; and Riley, age 3. A fourth child was born to the couple after Sgt. Kisling's death.

In early May, 2003, Private-First-Class Jess A. Givens was killed in a tank accident along the banks of the Euphrates River west of Baghdad, Iraq. Jesse Givens, son of Connie Givens of Springfield, Missouri, attended Springfield Glendale High School. He was 34 years old. His wife and five-year-old child, who live in Ft. Carson, Colorado, survive him. Givens was with the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment. His siblings live in Joplin and Springfield.

Twenty-one-year-old Jonathan Paul Barnes from McDonald County was killed in a grenade attack July 26, 2003 in Iraq. Barnes was a member of the 4th Infantry Division's 1st Battalion, 67th Armored Regiment. He joined the Army in April, 2001. At the time of his death he was guarding a hospital with two fellow soldiers who were also killed. James Barnes, Jonathan's father, who lives in Anderson, Missouri, and pastors the Greenwood Community Church near Southwest City, Missouri, described his son as a ''strong boy, who loved God and his country. He wanted to go,'' his father said. ''He died doing what he wanted to do.'' Jonathan Barnes was survived by his wife Amanda and daughter Michelle of Goodman, Missouri.

1st Lt. Benjamin J. Colgan was killed on November 1, 2003 in Baghdad while responding to a rocket propelled grenade attack. His wife Jill Kathleen Asay of Aurora, Missouri, said, ''He loved his country and wanted to make a difference in the world, and he gave his life to make a better life for the people of Iraq and for all Americans.'' Colgan had been in the U.S. Army 12 years. He was in the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Field Artillery Regiment, 1st Armored Division. Jill Asay gave birth to the couple's third child in December 2003. Daughters Grace, age 2, and Paige, age 1, also survived their father.

U.S. Army Staff Sergeant James 'Doug' Douglas Mowris was among 7 U.S. servicemen killed January 29, 2004 in an explosion in Ghazni, Afghanistan, about sixty miles southwest of the country's capital city. ''My husband was proud to serve,'' Mrs. Mowris said. ''He gave the greatest sacrifice anyone can give; that was his life . . . . He was a good husband and wonderful father.'' Doug Mowris was a member of the 414th Military Police Company based in Joplin, Missouri. Mowris had been in the U.S. Army or Army Reserves since 1984. Mowris was 37 years old. He was survived by his wife of 15 years, Michelle, and children Craig, age 14, and McKenzie, age 9.

These men died, leaving friends, family, and children to grieve and remember. We also remember another group of Americans who are civilian casualties of the War on Terror. John Willett and Craig Amundson were Ozarks natives who died in the September 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington.

All of these brave men are the faces of this war. They remind me every day of what we are fighting for.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as our nation mourns the loss of 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd, I rise today to honor this fallen son of Virginia. I would like to reflect on his honorable service and sacrifice to the United States of America.

I join his family, wife, and friends who now stand strong as they carry on the memory of his life. I extend a special condolence to his wife Sarah Cerri Cowherd, his parents Lenny and Mary Ann Cowherd of Culpeper, his brother Colby Cowherd, his sister Laura Cowherd, and his twin brother, Charles Cowherd. 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd will forever be in our hearts.

2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd called the Culpeper region home and graduated from the Wakefield Country Day School in Rappahannock County. Always striving to better himself, he applied for and accepted a nomination to the United States Military Academy, graduating in 2003. Upon concluding an excellent academic career, he married the love of his life, Sarah Cerri Cowherd.

Soon after their wedding, 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd answered his country's call to defend our flag and took command of a tank platoon assigned to Company C, 1st Battalion, 37th Armor Regiment, 1st Armored Division. In Iraq, 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd gave the ultimate sacrifice in the performance of his selfless duty. The life of 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd will stand forever as a perfect model for all men and women in uniform. He is a testament to his family, the American Military, and the United States of America.

2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd possessed the deepest conviction in the freedoms symbolized by the flag of the United States of America. Our flag symbolizes strength and conviction, perseverance and steadfast morals, justice and liberty. Where our flag stands, so stands freedom. The flag of the United States of America stands in the sands of Iraq because of 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd and so does freedom.

I join the people of the United States of America, the Commonwealth of Virginia, family and friends, and all those who hold the memory of 2nd Lt. Leonard Cowherd close—that today and everyday following, we honor his sacrifice and celebrate his life.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank my Colleagues, Congressman RANGEL and Congressman WALSH, for organizing all of us to take a moment to honor the brave men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom worldwide.

As we hold this moment of silence, and on the occasion of Memorial Day, let us not lose sight of brave veterans as well. Recently the House had the opportunity to honor these fine Americans through legislation that would have added $1.3 billion to the Veterans Affairs health care budget, and that would have increased funds by $500 million over the next 5 years for the Survivor Benefit Plan, which pays a military survivor 55 percent of their late spouse's retiree benefits, but is reduced to 35 percent at age 62. Both measures were defeated before they ever saw any debate by the full House. That this Congress would even consider the idea of cutting military families' benefits shows a disconcerting emphasis on misguided budget priorities.

In previous congressional sessions, I have voted to authorize increases in cost-of-living adjustments for veterans receiving disability compensation and their surviving family members, to expand long-term care services for veterans and allow Veterans Affairs to generate increased revenue to help pay for health care costs, and to increase funding for Veterans Affairs' state extended care facilities construction grant program by $10 million. I firmly believe that additional benefits are critical to the future success, stability, and retention levels for our armed forces. More importantly, this is the right thing to do for Texas, our great Nation, and the hardworking families of our brave troops and veterans.

There is absolutely no excuse to duck our responsibilities to the men and women of our armed forces, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues do not continue to confuse budget priorities when it comes to standing up for these all too important Americans.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, it is proper that the House take a moment to remember the brave American men and women of our armed forces who

have died defending freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In particular, I want to take this time to remember heroes from my district in western Wisconsin.

First Lieutenant Jeremy L. Wolfe, U.S. Army, of Menomonie, Wisconsin. Lieutenant Wolfe was assigned to the 4th Battalion, 101st Aviation Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky. He died serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom on November 15, 2003.

Major Christopher J. Splinter, U.S. Army, of Platteville, Wisconsin. Major Splinter was assigned to the 5th Engineer Battalion, 1st Engineer Brigade, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. He died serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom on December 24, 2003.

Private First Class Bert E. Hoyer, U.S. Army Reserve, of Ellsworth, Wisconsin. Private Hoyer was assigned to the 652nd Engineer Company, Ellsworth, Wisconsin. He died serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom on March 10, 2004.

Private First Class Gregory R. Goodrich, U.S. Army Reserve, of Bartonville, Illinois. Private Goodrich's mother lives in Hillsboro, Wisconsin. He was assigned to the 724th Transportation Company, Bartonville, Illinois. Private Goodrich died serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom on April 9, 2004.

These young men paid the ultimate price to enhance our security and protect our liberties; they also gave the people of Iraq the greatest gift of all: their freedom. I want to extend my heartfelt sympathies to their families and friends. Young leaders like these exemplify all that is good and decent about America.

On behalf of a grateful nation, we thank all our brave men and women serving in hard and dangerous conditions to bring stability and freedom to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan. God bless those who are serving and those who have fallen. Their sacrifice is honored by all Americans.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who have given their lives serving their country in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As Memorial Day approaches, I hope that each man, woman, and child in this country pauses to remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice defending our Nation.

Over the past two years, five young men from the district I represent have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan:

Staff Sergeant Brian Thomas Craig, died in Afghanistan on April 15, 2002;

Sergeant Keelan Moss, died in Iraq on November 2, 2003;

Private First Class Armando Soriano, died in Iraq on February 1, 2004;

Private First Class Leroy Sandoval, Jr., died in Iraq on March 26, 2004; and

Sergeant Gregory Wahl, died in Iraq on May 3, 2004.

No words can express our gratitude for the sacrifices these young men made to defend our country.

All those who have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan are heroes, and we will forever be grateful for their sacrifice.

As this Memorial Day approaches, I once again ask my colleagues and my fellow Americans to join me in remembering those who have served, those who are serving, and especially those who have given their lives serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as we approach another celebration of Memorial Day, it is incumbent that we pay homage to the Nation's veterans and war dead with more than just words. Rather, we reflect on how our actions honor or may dishonor this great republic for which they enlist to defend. Indiana's veterans and war dead share in this tribute.

Memorial Day, originally called Decoration Day, is a day of remembrance for those who have died in our Nation's service.

Those that we remember—veterans—are precious benchmarks for how well we have maintained all of the freedoms and democratic principles they fought and died for.

Veterans fought for the survival of all the things that made the United States, the leader of the free world: Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for each citizen and not the least—our great Constitution which undergirds this Republic.

It is in defense of our democratic principles and the freedoms that we uphold and value for each citizen with no respect to wealth, social rank, or might, that we form a military, that we have veterans, that we honor them on Memorial Day.

My memorial to Hoosier veterans and the war dead is to revere what they fought and died to preserve:

> We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty, to ourselves, and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

We are trustees of a future that remembers and honor the past and living freedoms. As we honor them this Memorial Day, let us refresh our commitment to the trust we bear for the days and years ahead. That is the fitting memorial—to honor their service with meaning as we remember daily why they serve.

With special tribute to the war dead of the seventh congressional district of Indiana in the Iraq theatre: Pvt. Jesse M. Halling and Pfc Derek L. Hallal.

Mr. GONZALES. Mr. Speaker, I rise humbly today in recognition of the brave men and women of the United States military, past and present.

Memorial Day has become a day in which many Americans have the opportunity to spend time with their friends and family. It is important to remember, however, that the purpose of this day is to honor, as a Nation, those who have sacrificed their lives in service to their country. These defenders of freedom were husbands and wives, parents and children, friends, and neighbors. They had plans for the future and a love for their country. I urge each and every American to take a moment this Memorial Day to remember and honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay special recognition to three individuals from the 20th Congressional District of Texas who were killed in service to their Nation in Iraq.

Army Pfc. Anthony Scott Miller was the first soldier from San Antonio killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. This friendly 19-year-old enlisted because, according to his brother, he saw it as a way to better himself. Anthony had only been in the Army for a year when an Iraqi surface-to-surface missile hit a tactical operations center of the Army's 3rd Infantry Division, killing Anthony and three others.

Staff Sgt. Rodrigo Gonzalez was born in Mexico and his family immigrated to the U.S. when he was just 1 year old. Like many members of his family, including his twin brother Ricardo, Rodrigo was a true patriot—he chose to serve in the U.S. military. His family has said that Rodrigo loved this country and that he had plans to purse a medical career after finishing his participation in the military. He had been in Kuwait for only 3 weeks when the Black Hawk helicopter he was in crashed.

Army Staff Sgt. Roland Lee Castro was a soldier, a husband, and a father. Roland went to Iraq in April 2003. He returned home last summer due to an injury, but, while recovering in San Antonio, Roland told his mother, ''I've got to bring my soldiers back safely.'' Shortly thereafter, the 26-year-old returned to Iraq to serve with his field artillery unit. There, he was accidentally shot. He leaves behind his wife, Liliana, and their 4-year-old daughter, Raquel Lee.

This Memorial Day, I ask that we remember Rodrigo, Roland, Scott, and the many other inspiring men and women who have lost their lives in service to this great nation. On behalf of all Americans, I wish to thank military personnel and their loved ones for their profound sacrifices, God bless.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, I rise today to salute two members of the military from the Fifth District of Virginia, who gave their lives in service to the United States in the war on terrorism.

LTC William R. Watkins III, lived in Halifax County, and SGT Michael Dooley lived in Bedford County. Both of these men loved this Nation and served bravely in Iraq in the war against terrorism. Their untimely deaths in the spring of 2003 came as they defended the freedoms that we cherish.

Because Lieutenant Colonel Watkins and Sergeant Dooley joined their fellow soldiers in removing the Taliban and Saddam Hussein from power, the terrorists no longer have Afghanistan and Iraq from which they can operate with impunity and with statesponsored support to plot, plan, and mastermind another event like September 11 in our country.

Because of the bravery of Lieutenant Colonel Watkins and Sergeant Dooley and the other hundreds of men and women who have given their lives, the United States and much of the World is safer, and we thank all of those who are in uniform this Memorial Day.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully rise during this moment of silence to honor and acknowledge members of the armed forces from my district, Missouri's Fifth, and commend those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in service to our grateful nation for their valor, strength and commitment. I also commend those six Missouri soldiers injured while serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan who are being treated at the VA Hospital in Kansas City. These courageous men have performed admirably and served unconditionally on behalf of our country. I extend to them my deepest respect and gratitude.

I was honored to visit Private Phillip Ramsey of Kansas City on several occasions at Walter Reed Hospital. Private Ramsey suffered injuries this past September to his left arm and right leg when an explosive device hit

his convoy en route between Tikrit and Baghdad, Iraq. He has exemplified courage and strength in his service to our nation and was awarded the Purple Heart and promoted to Specialist for his bravery. He is now back in Kansas City after spending eight months in recovery at Walter Reed Hospital and continues his service in the military. He has made his family and our country proud.

Army Spc. Joel L. Bertoldie of Independence, Mo. was killed on July 18, 2003 when his vehicle ran over an explosive in Fallujah, Iraq. I was privileged to present his family with a flag flown over the Capitol in his honor, and to join them at his memorial service to pay tribute to a fine son, father and citizen. A former Truman high school student, Specialist Bertoldie served honorably in Operation Iraqi Freedom and was awarded the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, National Defense Service Ribbon and Good Conduct Medal for his valor. His spirit will live on in his son, and his memory will inspire all those whose lives he touched.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues to praise these heroic soldiers and the sacrifices they have made. God bless them and God bless our Nation.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is our opportunity, as a nation, to pause and pay tribute to the millions of Americans who gave their lives for this country. We enjoy our freedom and prosperity because we are citizens of a nation that believes in service, dedication, and honor. We believe in liberty and our men and women have always willingly stepped up when called upon in defense of freedom.

This year, the Memorial Day weekend celebration on the National Mall will specifically honor America's World War II generation. The National World War II Memorial, which was authorized by Congress in 1993 in memory of those who served and died in World War II, will be dedicated in Washington, D.C., on Saturday, May 29, 2004. Sixteen million Americans fought valiantly, far from home, to protect not just our nation, but the entire world.

More than 400,000 Americans died during this war. Thousands more gave their lives during subsequent wars in Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, and most recently in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I would also like to take a moment to give my thanks to the soldiers from my home state of Utah. Over the past few years, nearly four thousand Utahns from the National Guard and Reserves, were sent into harm's way in the Middle East, or supported those on the front lines. I am so proud of these men and women—from the Wasatch Front, from St. George, Vernal, Cedar City, and other cities. I am proud of their commitment, grateful for their service, and deeply sorry for the families of those who won't be returning home.

God bless this Nation, and the men and women who serve so valiantly and with honor.

---

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

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio 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 Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BACHUS 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

---

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

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

---

## CONCERNING THE VICE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY TASK FORCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my concern this evening over Vice President CHENEY's abusing his power as Vice President to continue to keep secret documents that could significantly impact our Nation's future energy policy and the effect the Bush administration's energy policies are having on American families and on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, almost immediately after entering office, Vice President CHENEY took it upon himself to convene what would later be called the energy task force. The unnamed participants of this secret task force came together to advise the Bush administration on energy policy and develop what would become the administration's official energy plan. However, in the 3 years since the energy task force released its report, the Vice President has done everything he can to keep the records and participants of the task force secret. This task force played a critical role in developing a major policy initiative with a direct impact on everything from our economy to our environment. Still, the Vice President has refused to let the American people know who made up this energy task force or how and why the task force came to the conclusions that it did.

I am going to get back to this in a minute, but first I want to address the rise in gas prices which I think ultimately is related to the issue of the energy task force.

□ 2015

Earlier today, I heard the argument that if Congress passes the energy bill devised by the secret Cheney task force, consumers would be alleviated from the high gasoline prices we are witnessing across the country. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that not only is this argument foolish, but it is also wrong. The Republican-passed energy bill would do nothing to address the rising cost of gasoline; and, in fact, the bill has provisions that would make gasoline even more expensive.

In fact, a study released in February by the Energy Information Administration found that the provisions in the energy bill would have only a negligible effect on energy production, consumption, and prices; but that negligible effect would be far outweighed by a provision requiring the use of ethanol. The report concluded that such a provision would actually increase the average gasoline price by 3 cents per gallon and the price for reformulated gasoline by an average of 8.1 cents. So the study concludes that provisions in the Republican energy bill would actually increase gas prices, and I certainly know that my constituents would not like to see that happen, particularly as we now move into the Memorial Day week.

What President Bush and his administration do not understand is that high gas prices impact all of us, consumers and businesses alike. Gasoline prices have increased 38 percent since December 2003, with the average price for a gallon of regular unleaded at just over $2. High fuel costs translate into a loss of profit margins for the manufacturing and transportation sectors that force prices for products and services higher, hitting American consumers twice. Not only do Americans need to dole out more cash to fill their gas tanks with the little disposable income that they have left; they are be strangled by rising health care costs, higher education costs, and now higher costs in goods and services.

I just want to give some stories from struggling Americans that show that the hardships are being felt from coast to coast. I quote first DeAnn from Salt Lake City, Utah, who writes: ''My husband and I own a small trucking company. Due to the rise in fuel, we have let three drivers go and sold the trucks and trailers. This was very hard to do, but in an effort to keep the other two drivers working, we had to. I know of two other small companies that are doing the same, and the burden is just too much.''

I have another letter from Sara, who lives in Virginia Beach, Virginia, and she writes: ''As a military family, the rising gas prices are taking a big chunk of our disposable income. We have two small fuel-efficient cars, thankfully, but our cost to fill up our cars is easily $10 more every time. Unfortunately, we will not be driving much this summer because of it. I really wish the President would take more of an interest in the problems of middle working-class families like ours.''

Not only does Sara think, Mr. Speaker, that President Bush does not care about the impact that gasoline prices have on Americans, but another gentleman, Jon Meade Huntsman, who is

the founder of the largest privately held chemical manufacturing corporation in the United States, was recently quoted saying: ''The average guy on the street is getting killed because this administration does not care.''

Mr. Speaker, many in Congress have requested that President Bush temporarily suspend deliveries to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and put this oil in the marketplace. If President Bush reduced the amount of oil placed in the Petroleum Reserve, more would be on the market and prices would moderate for Americans now. The SPR can then be replenished when oil prices are lower. But as we know, President Bush refuses to do this because of national security concerns, he claims. But I would like to know why President Bush has no concern for the health of the American economy.

The American people are tired of rising gas prices. In my State alone, in New Jersey, gas prices have increased 48 percent, costing New Jersey families an additional $869 per year. This figure jumps to $1,037 for households with teenagers. In the general U.S. marketplace, gasoline prices will cause a $1.3 billion increase in costs for farmers, which will force American consumers into paying higher prices for food. The trucking industry will experience a $6.3 billion increase in the cost of its services, and airlines will see a $7.5 billion increase because of fuel costs. In fact, just yesterday I read that Continental Airlines has sought to impose a fuel surcharge for their services and reported that it is considering layoffs and cuts in wages and pension benefits in response to the struggle they are facing with the surging oil prices.

So the real impact of all this is a slowdown in the economy with a potential even for more job losses. In fact, an estimate by Merrill Lynch shows that every penny increase in gasoline prices at the pump is equal to $1 billion in lost consumer spending. That is nearly $25 billion in lost spending since the beginning of this year.

All of this is happening on the watch of the Bush administration that vowed to make energy policy a priority in the United States. Yet 4 years after President Bush took office, we have no national energy policy, and we have no national energy policy because the bill that the White House presented to Congress was filled with an extraordinary collection of energy industry giveaways. And to make matters worse, these giveaways do little or really nothing to moderate gas prices.

The President should have promoted meaningful policies that would increase fuel efficiency and conservation measures and provide for expanded use of renewable and alternative fuels.

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what exactly has the Bush administration done over the last 4 years to cut gas prices? During that time the country lost five refineries with the total number of operating refineries dropping from 158 to 153; and while Republicans blame difficult regulatory hurdles for new refineries, I would like to highlight that the Democrats included a policy in our 2001 energy plan with streamlined regulatory guidelines for permitting new refineries or for additional capacity to existing facilities when these permits did not detrimentally impact environmental standards.

I would also like to highlight data compiled by Bloomberg showing that mergers over the last few years have partially contributed to today's high gas prices. Since President Bush took office in January 2001, the administration has approved 33 takeovers totaling $19.6 billion. The Federal Trade Commission took no action to prevent any one of these 33 mergers. And today, Mr. Speaker, the largest five refineries operating in America, ConocoPhillips, Royal Dutch Shell, ExxonMobile, BP, and Valero, control over 52 percent of domestic refining capacity, up 18 percent in a decade. The top 10, which includes ChevronTexaco, Citgo, Marathon, Sunoco, and Tesoro, control 78.5 percent, up 22 percent. With this market concentration, I think it is imperative that this administration seriously consider and review the impact that mergers have on consumers rather than watching out only for the CEOs who benefit from these business mergers.

While the Bush administration has expressed the concern for rising prices, it seems like they are completely disregarding the March 2001 report by the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, FTC, which concluded that during that summer of 2000 price spike, certain suppliers had pursued ''profit-maximizing strategies,'' intentionally withholding gasoline supplies or delaying shipping as a tactic to drive up prices. But today the Bush administration is doing nothing to investigate whether a similar situation might be occurring now.

In fact, while Americans are paying higher prices at the pump, oil companies are posting record profits. In the first quarter of this year, ChevronTexaco reported a 294 percent increase in profits; British Petroleum, 165 percent increase; Exxon Mobile, 125 percent increase; and ConocoPhillips, a 44 percent increase in record profits.

I would also like to note that policies not related to the energy bill actually increased demand in consumption of gasoline. In February, President Bush extended for another 4 years the duel-fuel loophole. This loophole allows auto manufacturers who produce vehicles that can run on more than one fuel type, although they rarely do, a tax credit towards meeting CAFE standards for the entire fleet. What this means, Mr. Speaker, in effect is that these companies can reduce fuel economy for the millions of other cars that they sell. And according to the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, this means the U.S. will consume an extra 40 to 110 million barrels of oil from 2005 to 2008. Clearly, the Bush administration is not promoting policies that relieve Americans from high gas prices.

What the administration really should be promoting are policies that make gasoline supplies more stable and provide resources for alternative energy sources. For instance, oil companies should be required to expand gasoline storage capacities and require them to hold significant amounts in that storage, and the administration should reserve the right to order these companies to release this stored gas in order to address supply and demand fluctuations.

I also think that conservation and efficiency standards should be a priority. Democrats have always supported and have proposed innovative tax incentives for gains in energy conservation and efficiency such as a nonrefundable tax credit for higher efficiency vehicles.

Before I finish, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to go back to what I mentioned earlier regarding Vice President CHENEY's energy task force. After 3 years of hiding the details regarding the task force, it appeared that we might finally get some of the information CHENEY was fighting so hard to keep secret. The Sierra Club, as we know, and the conservative group Judicial Watch earlier this year jointly sued Vice President CHENEY and the energy task force, seeking an accounting of energy industry participation in crafting the Bush administration's destructive energy policy.

In response to that suit, a district court ordered the administration to provide information about participation from these industries, which the Bush administration refused to do. Of course, the President claimed constitutional immunity from these kinds of inquiries. But the district court rejected the Bush administration's contention, pointing out that the administration was attempting to ''cloak what is tantamount to an aggrandizement of executive power with the legitimacy of precedent where none exists.'' That is a quote from the court. I will read it again: that the Bush administration was attempting to ''cloak what is tantamount to an aggrandizement of executive power with the legitimacy of precedent where none exists.''

Refusing, however, to give in, of course, Vice President CHENEY appealed the district court's decision, asking, basically, the district court to make new law that would effectively shield the Bush administration from any scrutiny. And I just have to say again, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, this is the height of arrogance on the part of the Bush administration. They actually go to court and they ask the court to shield President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and the rest of the administration from any scrutiny. Fortunately, the court denied that request, and then of course what did the Vice President do? He appealed the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, and in December the Supreme Court agreed to

make argument public on the case. Of course, we do not have a decision yet, but they have heard the case.

And the last thing that I wanted to mention in this regard, and I have mentioned it before here on the House floor, is the whole issue of Justice Scalia's involvement in the case and the fact that, in my opinion, he should have recused himself from any participation when this case came before the Supreme Court. We all know the story: Vice President CHENEY treated Justice Scalia to a personal hunting vacation down in Louisiana. They went on Air Force Two down to Louisiana. And, of course, several questions have been raised by not only me but others with regard to this hunting trip or duck hunting trip to Louisiana and the potential conflict of interest. And I would just like to mention some of those questions again tonight before I close.

First, was the energy executive that hosted the Vice President and Justice Scalia on this duck hunting trip to Louisiana a member of the energy task force? Of course we do not know because the whole point of the suit is to determine who was a member of the energy task force, and so far the Vice President is not willing to provide that information.

Second, was the Vice President attempting to use this trip, the duck hunting trip, as a way to persuade Justice Scalia that the documents being requested should remain secret under the cloak of executive privilege?

And, third, how could either Vice President CHENEY or Justice Scalia think that this trip in which both flew to and from Louisiana together on Air Force Two would not look like a conflict of interest?

These questions remain unanswered, but I do not think there is any question in my mind and the public's mind. Certainly there have been many editorials on this subject that have said that Justice Scalia should have recused himself from hearing this case.

□ 2030

Of course, the one thing that I keep thinking in the back of my mind, Mr. Speaker, is, what if this ends up being one of those rather frequent 5–4 decisions, and Justice Scalia is one of the five? What are we going to think about that, given this trip to Louisiana?

I am going to yield to the gentlewoman, but I did want to say, the one thing that is really significant about this Energy Task Force and the one thing that I am trying to bring out tonight is, regardless of what you think about the Energy Task Force and what happened behind closed doors in these secret meetings, because we do not really know what happened, hopefully we will find out at some point, depending on the Supreme Court's decision, but we know one thing clearly, and that is the task force came up with a bad energy policy.

There is no doubt that the energy industry succeeded with its influence during these secret, closed-door meetings. The one thing we know is they managed to craft an energy policy that benefited them, rather than benefiting Americans, who, at the time, desperately needed relief from high energy prices. That continues today with the high gas prices. The problems continue, and the Bush administration does not want to do anything about it.

I see the gentlewoman from Texas is here, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for taking the time to very deliberatively chronicle for this body some of the concerns that we have expressed on a number of occasions.

Let me just expand on the gentleman's presentation, primarily because I think it is important to note he is from New Jersey and I am from Texas. The energy industry is one that I work collaboratively with as constituents of my area, and I have often been here on the floor indicating the importance of an energy policy.

We remember very well the number of Energy Secretaries in the Clinton administration, and on a number of occasions there were occurrences there that we disagreed with, but we were consistently working to give input on developing and embracing energy policy; and I still think, for the industry, that is the best way to go. That means we talk about conservation, we talk about solar, we talk about wind power, we talk about domestic production, which many of us have discussed over the period of time.

I think what the administration is failing to see is that we are now at a logjam. We are stagnant, because we have a problem not only with the energy bill being stagnated, because it is one that has not brought in as many of the interests as it should, but we now have this parallel issue, where, frankly, we cannot get to the bottom of the truth; and we are using, if you will, judicial procedures that are thwarting simply providing us with the truth.

This issue of ''executive privilege,'' which is something very sensitive to me, being on the Committee on the Judiciary, but I think a lot of that is overcome by the very facts that the gentleman has just allowed us to hear, and that is, of course, the close relationship between Justice and the Vice President, the disregard of that close relationship, to the extent it does not matter finding out why others with other perspectives could not have been part of those discussions.

Our understanding is that any number of conservation groups repeatedly tried to access the meetings and provide information, and they were denied.

We do not suggest, nor do I think the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is suggesting, that policy-makers should not have the benefit of different perspectives, whether it be industry or whether it be others. But what we are talking about is the light of day. Government has to be transparent. Frankly, what we have seen is nontransparency.

Might I just add to the gentleman's line of reasoning here, I know that the gentleman worked very hard on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and this is an issue of great importance, but on the Committee on the Judiciary, this is a question of whether or not there has been an abuse of power.

My disappointment is, I recall maybe 3 or 4 years ago, let us say 4 years ago, in an earlier administration, neither the door of the Committee on Government Reform nor the Committee on the Judiciary or the lights of those committees were ever turned off. We were in a constant state of investigation, trying; I suppose a majority at that time would argue they were trying to present a transparent government.

But not only do we have the energy collapse and catastrophe and debacle, I am still, if you will, seething, I will use that term, and dismayed by Medicare.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentlewoman is saying, because I think when we talk about the Republican abuse of power and we use the Energy Task Force, or I think she is going to go into the Medicare issue as well, what we have to explain, I think, to our constituents and to the public is that the Republican majority here in the House has simply made it impossible, if you will, for Democrats, any Democrat, to participate in the process.

So when I say that it is important to know what happened at this Energy Task Force and who was on it and what they did, it is not because of some secret feeling that this is crucial; it is because of the impact on public policy.

We know that when the energy bill came to the House, as the gentlewoman mentioned, from my Committee on Energy and Commerce, and came to the floor, basically it was a bill that came from this task force and that moved through the committee to the floor and over to the other body without any major changes, because they do not allow Democrats on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or even Republicans sometimes, to make changes from what the administration requested.

So if we had gone through the normal deliberative process, where the White House came up with an idea, but there were all kinds of changes or a consensus was reached with the Democrats, where amendments were allowed, where we had a full debate, then maybe this would not be as significant.

But that is not the way this Republican majority has been operating. They abuse their power by not having the deliberations, by not having a consensus in the committee, by not having amendments, by not having full debate on the floor.

That is why what this secret task force did becomes even more important, because essentially they put together the bill that passed the House and that is now the Republican energy policy.

We just have so many examples. I know the gentlewoman is going to get into them now with the Medicare bill, where they abused their power and did not allow the Democrats, the minority, to have any input. It is an abuse of the system. It really is.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The gentleman has made a very good point. I think it is very important, because we are speaking about the very nature of our government, beyond the concept of Democrats, Republicans or a two-party government. We are also talking about checks and balances and oversight and responsibilities of this body.

I do not believe when the dictates of oversight in our procedural body of rules that govern the House, they do not say, make sure those responsibilities of oversight only fall to Republicans when Democrats are in charge of the executive, or they only fall to Republicans or Democrats, if you will, or vice versa. It is the system of government, of transparency, that we are now speaking to.

I think the consternation, if you will, and in some instances, outrage, is frankly because this is going on without the light of day.

The gentleman has spoken about the energy bill. I have heard the ranking member eloquently announce the difficulty in even having a conference on the bill so that we could make this legislative initiative better for the American people, not for the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey or for the distinguished Member from California or for the Member from Texas.

It is, frankly, to make this a working legislative initiative that will actually pass both Houses, if you will, the other body, and actually implement a process that the American people can utilize.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if I can just reclaim my time, the gentlewoman makes a very important point that I want to emphasize, and that is the unwillingness and the arrogance, if you will, of the Republican majority to not allow for input from the Democrats. And the consequence of not having a consensus on something as important as national energy policy means that we never pass a bill and that we continue to be energy-dependent on Mideast oil and other foreign sources.

This is because of the breakdown of Members. Even though the Republicans are in the majority in both Houses, the majority is very close. So if you take a position, as this Republican majority does in their leadership, that we are not going to allow input from Democrats, or even other views, then the consequence is, you have a stalemate and you do not pass a bill.

That is the reason why we continue to be so dependent on foreign oil, because they are not willing to try to come up with something that we can all agree on. They will not allow input.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman again clarifies the point. We are not only energy dependent, we are energy deficient, because I believe we could find ways cooperatively to look at alternative sources of energy.

Coming from the State I come from, domestic production in many areas is very safe technologically. We have not enhanced that in ways where it has been welcomed. But because we have this cloud over this energy legislation, the gentleman is absolutely right, we are at a standstill. And while we are on this floor, there are millions of Americans in line for gasoline at gasoline stations, there are volunteers for Meals on Wheels, volunteers who take meals in to shut-ins' homes who are saying, I have to stop volunteering because I cannot afford $2 a gallon gasoline, which we are paying here in the United States.

Of course, Europeans are listening to us with somewhat of a smile on their face.

But the point is, that is not where the economy is now. Truck drivers are pulling trucks off to the side. Deliverers of pizza are pulling their cars off. So the quality of life has been impacted by denying people who are getting to school, trying to improve their lives, getting to an hourly wage job, trying to support their family. All of them are being impacted by the fact we are at inertia because of this energy legislation.

If I might, just as an example, to continue this inequity, we see in both the administration and this Congress, we just got through finishing with the defense authorization bill. There were a number of Democratic amendments that would have been enormously valid and helpful in terms of where we need to move our military, both in terms of clearing up and saying to the world clearly that we denounce the atrocities that occurred in the Iraqi prison at the hands of our military personnel, as we abhor the decapitating of one of our very fine and able Americans. We are not diminishing that. That was beyond expression, beyond words.

But in order for us to be America, the country that rises to the highest moral value, then we must show that we have oversight. Yet we spent the last 2 weeks talking, and I might say most of the talking has been in the other body; not investigating, not deliberating on how we can, if you will, pull out, extract out those who should be held accountable in that instance.

The gentleman is right, I was about to mention Medicare.

As we know, on June 1, these prescription drug cards will be coming out. I imagine that all of us might be able to see some glimmer of positiveness in any discount that our seniors would get. But as the gentleman recalls, I think now for 6 to 8 years, we have been constantly pounding the pavement, pounding on this podium and talking about a guaranteed prescription drug benefit, which some months ago we were on the precipice of attempting to get with a Medicare bill that could have been helpful to all Americans.

But, unfortunately, again we have quagmire of smoke and mirrors, and questions of abuse have now raised their head, investigations that are not yet finished. There is some talk of bribery that occurred. But, more importantly, procedurally we find ourselves in a very strange climate, with almost, I have now put it up to 6 hours, maybe it was a 4-hour vote open on the floor of this House in the wee, wee hours of the night, and frankly I believe that that is not the American way.

□ 2045

Mr. PALLONE. We had a hearing today in the commerce committees, the Subcommittee on Health on the drug cards. And, of course, it was a hearing that was requested by the Republican majority because if we request it, they do not give us one. And I was amazed by their inability, not that I was amazed, their total inability to show the positive aspect of this discount drug card.

I mean, obviously the purpose of the hearing was to showcase that this was a great idea that seniors were going to benefit from it. They put up the Web site and showed you how to access the Web site and showed you the hotline, how to access the program. Even with that, all that effort, it was a sham. It was a farce.

These discount drug cards do not provide any savings. I had my seniors call me, first of all, most of them, many of them do not even have a computer so they can access the Web site. We tried to call the hotline yesterday, 30 minutes before you can even get on the hotline. And it is so confusing to the average senior that they have to kind of go on this Web site and see, of 70-some-odd cards, which one will offer a discount for a particular drug that they might need. But what they do not tell you, of course, is that next week the card company can change the price of the drug or they can decide to drop the drug, and that if you go to the local pharmacy, they do not have any obligation to take the card. Even if they take the card, they can charge more than the price because they may have to show a profit. So it is just unbelievable to me.

Most of my seniors cannot even figure it out by looking at the Web site. I have to be honest, not only could I not figure it out, but there was an article in last week's Washington Post where one of the reporters, a long-time health reporter, went through this whole maze, and basically said it took her 9 hours to go through the process. And at the end of it, she did not know which card she should opt for.

Again, it is what you said. This is a function of the fact that the Republicans do not want any input from the Democrats. If they had taken amendments, listened to us, tried to adopt some of the suggestions that we had, I believe that we could have come up with a good benefit. We do not even have a benefit now. It does not even go into effect until 2006, and it will cost you more out of pocket than you will benefit from. And these are, again, the result of this arrogance, this abuse of power on the part of the Republican majority.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It is a single thinking. Do you realize that just this past week, I think most of us got at least a slight shock, maybe it was even a larger shock, when they came to the floor of the House and did a, what would you call it, an en bloc rule with four and five bills in one rule to begin to dismantle rights that workers here in America have cherished for as long as we have had the OSHA regulations and rules that have created a safer workplace.

Certainly concepts that should have been deliberated and debated for a long period of time, frankly, that maybe again in a bipartisan way, we could have few common grounds on the concept of helping small businesses, which is what it was represented to be.

But when you shut off workers from the courthouse, when you open up opportunities to keep bad activity going in your workplace so that you do not have to respond to the OSHA citations, you can extend the time frame or not respond to them so you keep an unsafe working place under the pretense of being someone who is too economically unfeasible, if you will. All those bills passed with little sight and oversight by the American people.

And here we are now with the child tax credit. Of course, that is a policy question. Some people want to raise the deficit $202 billion more than we already have. When I say ''raise it,'' make it go up more, so we are right in line getting $228 billion more to add to the deficit and leave 3 million working Americans off the list of a child tax credit. Again, that is a policy decision. I do not put that in the abuse of power, but I do put it in the inability to see the important aspect of us working together for better policies that serve the American public and serve our constituents across the board. That is a problem.

Mr. PALLONE. I think it is a form of arrogance, if you think about it. Here you have a situation where we are in a deficit which continues to grow, a huge deficit, one of the biggest we have ever seen; and rather than try to give some money back to working people below a certain income, I think my recollection is that if your family, and you are working and working and you are making minimum wage, you would not get any money back. You get no credit. And if you are a family that is up in the 300,000 bracket, you get a $500 credit.

So if you are buying into the theory, which I think the Republicans articulate, that somehow this tax credit will benefit the average guy so that they can go out and spend the money and that helps the economy and all, this is what they articulate on the floor, how is it that you do not give it to the guy, the working person who is making a lower salary, he probably is more likely to go out and spend the money because he does not have that much money. He has to go out and buy food or staples for the family, clothing; as opposed to somebody in the 300,000 bracket who would probably put it in the bank because they do not need to spend it.

So their theory, even their own ideology, they do not practice it. They do not practice what they preach.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I will just tell a story about Margaret in Houston who makes between 8 and $26,000, a student with an 8-year-old son. And she wrote an article just a year ago when we were fighting this same battle last summer.

She said it is simply a shame that she would be the one trying to make ends meet as a student, improving her life, raising an 8-year-old son, would not get the child tax credit. What is she to do with her child? How is she to pay her bills or to do as the gentleman said, to infuse the economy? They are simply left out, and we find that they are left out today.

One of the things I wanted to raise, I respect very much the first amendment, but I know that you are familiar with the question that we always raise with the media and not highlighting the substitute amendment that we worked very hard to put together. The American people should know that we are here fighting on the floor of the House, that we had an initiative, the Democrats, and it worked. It was paid for. It did not leave 3 million people behind. It gave to those making between 10,000 and $26,000; it put it to 2011 when we can possibly then see a better day, have the deficit decreased and be able to legitimately consider making it permanent. 2011 is a good and decent time frame.

This is only 2004, but yet we had to rush to making it, if you will, permanent now and do the $228 billion in deficit, and it just does not make any sense. Let me just for a moment add, if I might, some of the missing elements. I want to, and I will be happy to yield back to the gentleman, but I also just want to leave, as we are on adjournment, I think there are a lot of things left undone, particularly as it relates to the need of a strategy for Iraq. I do not think any of us know what the strategy is for Iraq. We know that every day more and more body bags are coming home. We also realize, of course, that there is a need for peace and security in Iraq, but we would like to have a strategy from this administration. We have not heard one.

We do not know whether we are going to be able to transition the government. We do not know what kind of security is in place. We do not know ultimately what is an exit strategy. It is just not functioning, and we have leadership in the Defense Department that we are concerned about, but I do want to mention items that I think are left undone.

I am concerned, for example, about Sudan, and what comments are being made by this administration. I know that we had a resolution, but there is slaughter and massacre going on there on a regular basis. There are refugees from Sudan at the border in Chad. There is a breakdown. The United Nations is struggling.

I think this administration needs to take the leadership in this area, primarily because none of us want to repeat the tragedy in Rwanda. It looks as though certainly we have cause to be wary, and I would like to make a very clear point to see some answers, not only from this administration but from this Congress.

Then, of course, we have heard some good news, at least some representations of numbers out of Haiti; but I still believe that unless you embrace all of the political parties, unless you have a schedule for democratic elections, unless you investigate what happened with respect to President Aristide and his removal from the country, I think there is work left undone, and I think it is imperative that we begin to answer those kinds of questions on the international level.

I know we are about to venture into the appropriations process, and I raise for the administration the question of how they are going to support their requests for this increased supplemental in light of what we have just done today with the $228 billion deficit and spending on tax cuts.

In fact, I do not think there is a tax cut in this House that anyone has seen that they reject. At the same time there is such an enormous need. We have still not done anything about Leave No Child Behind. And the only reason I was adding this to the gentleman's discussion is because I think it is important on adjournment to realize that we are just full of work to be done and there is lack of cohesion and lack of agreement.

So we are going to get ready to go into the appropriations process in which we are somewhat delayed, and really we are going to be, I think, on rocky ground. We passed a budget resolution that is very disturbing, and that we allegedly are operating, you said, that has large gaping holes in it. It is not able to provide for a lot of issues that we are concerned about. So I am just squarely saying, departure and adjournment but a lot of work to be done.

The international world is looking for our leadership; there are a lot of problems that are percolating around the world. I would just offer to say that I believe I am a big supporter of Mideast peace and I just believe in engagement. And I would like to see the

United States more fully engaged than singular meetings that we have had with the administration. I want to see us with a team, working, because all of us are believers of the peace in that region, and I do not see that. So I consider that work left undone by this Congress and this administration.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could just interrupt, I think the gentlewoman makes some very valid points, and I think it relates back to what we were talking about before. You can call it abuse of power. You can to call it arrogance, this arrogance that we see here in this House on the part of the Republican majority and the Bush administration which essentially says, my way or the highway. We are not really interested in your input. We do not want to hear what the Democrats have to say. We are not interested in whatever suggestions you have, we see playing out with regard to the Bush administration's foreign policy, which is essentially unilateral, the cowboy. We are not interested in other countries' views. They were not interested in other countries, views or the U.N., which is sort of a manifestation of all the other countries together because we want to do everything on our own.

So that is why we went into Iraq without having our NATO allies or the major ones supportive or without having the U.N. support it because the idea is we do not need other people. We do not need help. That is why the effort, the gentleman mentions Haiti, was pretty much the same thing. We will unilaterally decide that it is time for Aristide to go, without really thinking about what the consequences might be. And the U.N. has suffered because we do not give any credence to it.

We suggest that the U.N. is incompetent or that somehow they are not something that we favor, and so then we are forced to go it alone and not have the help of our allies. In the case of Iraq, it means that we end up mostly having our own soldiers fight the battles and our own resources being used. And then what are the consequences here? The consequences are that we go further and further into debt, and that is, of course, only multiplied by the fact that we do all these tax cuts that you and I have been talking about all evening. So we have the deficit situation. We do not have the money for domestic problems because we are spending all the money unilaterally in Iraq and other places, and we are cutting taxes at the same time, mostly for the wealthy.

So given those circumstances, there is no money to pay for education programs or for health care or for housing or for all the other priorities that are important, particularly for people at a time when the middle-class person is hurting and they probably need some help from the Federal Government for some of these things.

□ 2100

This is all part of this arrogance, this abuse of power. I think it is domestic policy, as well as the foreign policy, and it does not seem to be getting any better.

If you talk about Iraq, what countries want to help us now? The President says he wants to go to the U.N.; he wants other countries to help us, but the opposite is happening. The countries are leaving because of our arrogance and our unwillingness to get them involved, and our unwillingness to reach out and say we need your help. When does the President ever say, we need your help? I never hear him say that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. You are absolutely right. The face that we have projected to the world needs a little bit of cleaning up, and so we need some articulated foreign policies that the world can understand.

I heard debate when we were discussing the motion to recommit here on the defense authorization bill, a very fair motion to recommit.

Just as an aside, this past week and the last couple of weeks, we denied the bill to have a substitute, the normal courtesies, and as I recall, the deans of this House who happen to be on our side of the aisle, have reflected and said they cannot remember when the Democrats were in the majority that denial of a substitute would be disallowed to the minority. It is certainly the rule of the majority, but not the tyranny of the majority, and so it is extremely disappointing.

But I recall the debate on the motion to recommit which we should state again was simply to have a select committee, a commission, to really effectively look into this issue, because a lot of people think this is pointing to Iraq.

No, this is pointing to international law, the Geneva Convention. This is saying to the world that when we sign and agree to a treaty, we really believe in it, because if the shoe is on the other foot, we are, if you will, darn sure not going to tolerate that kind of abuse of our prisoners of war.

How concerned we were when we had and we still have prisoners of war there. We still have some MIAs and prisoners of war to a certain extent, people that are missing in action right now, but people that are also, we know, prisoners of war. We still have that going on, MIAs in Vietnam, but we have people who are missing in Iraq.

The point is that you want to be sure that the convention is adhered to, and what I am saying is, there was a discussion here to reject it rather than doing it in a bipartisan way, because we are suggesting that the other people are worse than us, the other people are terrorists. And I respect the distinguished gentleman who offered opposition to the motion to recommit, but I believe that is wrong because we have an obligation to show the world that we are better than that and we adhere to the law.

May I just say one thing? I want to mention again some very fine constituents in my district and the United Nations Foundation, because through Federal Express and local leadership in Houston, Mike and Lisa out of Memphis, we are going to get, through the United Nations Foundation, books that Houston students collected to send to the children of Afghanistan.

And I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) who was part of us working together. So I want to mention a colleague who was very helpful, working together on this very issue. But that is a positive, but what we were trying to do in that instance was to show the world a better face, or another face, and that is the face of charitableness and understanding and desire for democracy and educating children, that there is a better way and that what we do have in America is good.

That is the difference with what I am seeing here; they are not understanding, that is, the majority, that this is not a tit for tat. This is not partisanship. This is attempting to govern, and it is all right to stand and be able to throw stones, but when we govern, we should be able to govern together.

The world looks to us to govern. They do not really see Democrats and Republicans. They see Americans and say, what are you doing as Americans, as the American Congress, the American Government? That is what they are asking for.

They are asking that in the Sudan. They are asking that in Afghanistan. They are asking that in Haiti and Iraq. They are asking that in the Mideast. They are asking what America is doing, so when you stand here and view your critique and criticisms as that very question: What is America doing?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlelady makes a good point.

Again, you talked about the abuse of the prisoners in Iraq, in the prison, and the violation of the Geneva Convention, but again, I think it goes back to what I said before. If you really believe that you can act unilaterally and that everything you do is right and you do not want input from anybody else, be it here in the House from other party Members like Democrats or from other countries, then you start buying into this notion that somehow international treaties, which are not unilateral, but done with other countries, do not have to be adhered to. And if you listen to some of the comments that have been made with respect to this administration, where actually arguments were being put forth by them, some of the people that were responsible for change in tactics with prisoners or interrogations in Afghanistan and Iraq, you hear them say, well, somehow this is a little different, the notion that the terrorists do not come under the Geneva Convention in Afghanistan. But then somehow you lead from that to say, well, then, the Iraqis

do not come under the Geneva Convention either.

So you start to stretch. You say, okay, terrorists are not active combatants in Afghanistan, or because they are terrorists and not under any state, but then you move that to Iraq and say, well, maybe the same thing is true of the Iraqis, even though it is a very different situation because we invaded Iraq.

Then you start to say, well, then, maybe you do not need the Geneva Convention, it does not apply to the situation. And that is the danger here; it is sort of unilateral philosophy arrogance, not willing to listen to others that gradually erodes the notion that you have treaty obligations or that you have to succumb to some sort of international agreement or international body like the U.N. And it is such a dangerous thing, it is really such a dangerous thing.

I do not usually compliment him because I think that for the most part his conduct has not been good, but I remember there were some newspaper reports that when the Secretary of State Colin Powell heard that there were some suggestions that the Geneva Convention did not have to be adhered to, he was outraged. I think that was in part because he had, as a general and as someone who had been instructed in the norms of war, realized that you could not say that the Geneva Convention did not apply in this situation in Iraq.

But I think some of the soldiers or some of the people in charge were convinced that somehow it did not apply; and that is the danger that we face. It is such a dangerous situation because once the norms of the Geneva Convention are not applied by us, then how can we expect anybody to apply them to us? The whole breakdown in any kind of legality during the war, I mean it is just an awful thing.

I yield back to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that you have absolutely, if you will, clarified again or made it understandable from what happens to us. And the Secretary of State, obviously, as a general, has served in that capacity, but more importantly, a combat officer, seen combat and knows what it is to be in combat and to rely upon the ability of the convention to set the standards for treatment for anyone who becomes a prisoner of war.

That is why, if I may go back again to Iraq, why I think it is such a disservice of this House not to have an investigation to begin to reset the standards and have oversight over those who are carrying out orders.

We know that General Miller, or Colonel Miller, I am not sure of the title, that used to be over Guantanamo Bay, with certain procedures that were questionable, then transferred over to Iraq. The question is, how do you figure that out? How do you determine that you either improve that or find the basis of those actions or the basis of those actions. Why do I not correct myself and say we should be changing those actions?

So it warrants us understanding that this is not a question of who is in charge, but it is more a question of doing the right thing.

That is what we are suggesting, that we are not doing the right thing here, and frankly, it does not do us well not to be doing the right thing. And, as well, we are being seen as a body that is not either conversant with the law or desirous of adhering to the law.

You made a very good point earlier that I wanted to focus on. How interesting it is that we are now seeking the support and collaboration of the United Nations. I think we need to be more vigorous in seeking that support, but I wish we had had that support, really, way back in the fall of 2002. We might have had a much better success story.

Again, as we approach Memorial Day, I want to be very clear and I know the distinguished gentlemen's commitment to the military, that we understand who is on the front lines. We understand the mourning families who will be remembering their loved ones, fresh in their minds, lost in Afghanistan and Iraq, and those who were lost in earlier wars, and we understand the sacrifice that they have made.

We understand the wounded who are now in various hospitals or rehabilitation centers or those who are now home with their families mending. We know their lives have been altered forever.

So I certainly stand here with my colleague to pay tribute to them as we leave for this Memorial Day work recess.

This is not the question that we are debating tonight, because I hope that they fully appreciate our desire to honor them. The moment of silence today was more than appropriate and the honoring of Armed Services Day. I think that those who wear that uniform know full well that we are honoring them or they are honored more by the integrity of their service.

So I hope that that is what is understood by the distinguished gentleman's remarks tonight, as I perceive them to be, and I am grateful that he has allowed me to join with him to hopefully set some kind of tone for when we return back that we are not enemies here in this place. We should be working together for the betterment of America and for the betterment of the world. We are not enemies.

I am gratified to have been able to be part of the gentleman's discourse this evening and maybe we will come back here and get to work and establish a foreign policy and a health care policy and an energy policy that will be befitting of the Founding Fathers of this place.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to add to the gentlewoman's comments because I think they are very appropriate for ending this special order tonight, and I thank the gentlewoman for being here.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent Resolution applauding the men and women who keep America moving and recognizing National Transportation Week.

H. Con. Res. 424. Concurrent Resolution honoring past and current members of the Armed Forces of the United States and encouraging Americans to wear red poppies on Memorial Day.

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

## YES, WE ARE BETTER OFF NOW THAN WE WERE FOUR YEARS AGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, lately, in a rare turn of events, House Democrats have adopted the old adage of Republican leaders and, in floor communications, they have posed the famous question from Reagan, Are you better off than you were 4 years ago?

Well, when the quote came, I think Democrats have found a moment of despair. We will welcome their call for comparison of today's economic, international and domestic status to that of 4 years. Yes, we are better off now.

Just look at the war on terror. The attacks on September 11 awakened the Nation to the threat of terror. Republicans have a clear strategy to keep Americans safe and to spread freedom and peace throughout the world.

In the past 3 years, we have seen great progress. Afghanistan is free, Libya is now disarmed, Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. Iraq is becoming a free country, making the heart of the Middle East more stable and America more secure.

The Republican-controlled House quickly passed legislation creating the Department of Homeland Security in 2002. All border activity has been consolidated into the Department of Homeland Security, a single agency, doing away with the fallible INS, or Immigration and Naturalization Service, that allowed the September 11 hijackers to slip through our borders, rent apartments, find employment and train in flight schools, only to have their visas approved by INS after they carried out attacks on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon.

The Department of Homeland Security is implementing background checks on 100 percent of applications for U.S. citizenship and has registered over 1.5 million travelers into the United States VISIT program.

Over 500,000 first responders have been trained in weapons of mass destruction, awareness and response since September 11, 2001.

The USA PATRIOT Act has broken down unnecessary barriers between intelligence and law enforcement officers, ensuring that the best available information about terrorist threats is provided to people who need it most.

After two rounds of across-the-board, Republican-led tax cuts in 2001 and 2003, America's economy is strong and growing stronger, and we have overcome the triple shock of terrorist attacks, corporate scandals and recession.

Americans are seeing the benefit of the Republican progrowth agenda. In the eighth straight month of growth, the economy created 288,000 jobs in April, bringing the total increase since August to more than 1.1 million jobs created.

□ 2115

The real gross domestic product has grown at its fastest rate in almost 20 years over the last three-quarters. Productivity has grown at its fastest rate in 40 years. Homeownership is at an all-time high, 68.6 percent, with substantial gains among minority homeowners. We have the highest total number of people working in the history of America. Let me repeat that. We have the highest number of workers in the entire history of America on the payroll today. Unemployment today is at its lowest rate, lower than at the average of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. The average earnings by American workers is up, higher than it has ever been before. These are high-paying jobs that are coming to America. Manufacturing jobs have also increased for the first time in a long time, 1.1 million jobs in total since August.

Now, we have had some really good news on the economy, but we need to do much more; and we will talk about that later. First, let me talk about health care. Republicans have been working to see that the rising costs of health care are capped and lowered, accessibility to quality care is expanded, and jobs for more Americans are created in the process.

Millions of Americans are benefiting from lower prescription drug costs and increased access to health care. In December 2003, a prescription drug benefit was signed into law that will make Medicare prescription drug coverage available to millions of seniors and people with disabilities for the first time since Medicare's inception.

Health savings accounts were signed into law to give employees more control over their health care decisions and the opportunity to save tax-free income for future health care costs.

The number of children enrolled in the State Children's Health Insurance Program increased from 4.6 million in 2001 to 5.8 million in 2003.

Now, let us talk about education. Under President Bush and the Republican-led Congress, No Child Left Behind was signed into law to ensure that all students become proficient at reading and math and to close the achievement gap that exists between students of different socioeconomic backgrounds. Students, teachers, and parents have seen the prospective effects of accountability, challenge, and incentive.

No Child Left Behind, or NCLB, funding for K through 12 has increased by 35 percent, and title I funding has increased 41 percent, the largest investment in education to date. While only 11 States are in full compliance with previous Federal education accountability standards in January of 2001, NCLB ensured that by June 2003 all 50 States had approved accountability plans to ensure that students become proficient in reading and math. Under NCLB, math scores have increased by 9 points for fourth graders and by 5 points for eighth graders since the 2000 National Assessment of Education Progress.

Under a Democrat watch, we would not be better off. With the Democrats in the majority, 34 million working families would not have received an average of $1,549 in tax relief each year; 47 million families would not have received the $1,000 child tax credit last summer for each child; 35 million Americans would still be paying the unfair double taxation on dividend income, discouraging them from investing in our economy; the defense of our homeland would still be spread among 22 different Federal agencies; 50,000 highly trained Federal screeners would not be protecting America's airports; 24 million Iraqis would still be living in fear under Saddam Hussein's hostile regime; more than 15 million Afghan citizens would still live under the oppressive brutal regime of the Taliban; two-thirds of al Qaeda's top leaders would still be on the loose, plotting attacks, while congressional Democrats treat terrorism as a law enforcement problem; millions of seniors would not benefit from access to discounted prescription drugs, and an eventual prescription drug benefit under Medicare; and millions of American employees would not be able to save pre-tax income towards future health care costs in personal health savings accounts.

The largest number in education to date, a 42.5 percent increase in funding, would never have seen its day in American classrooms; and only 11 out of 50 States would meet acceptable accountability standards in education today.

But things are better off under Republicans this year than they were 4 years ago. Now, every day we hear about how American jobs are going overseas. We have a chart here that reflects some of the issues that are going to be coming up and that I want to start talking about. But there is a reason why jobs have been going overseas. It is not Benedict CEOs, as we have heard before. It is not the wage levels in America. The responsibility lies right here in Congress.

Over the last generation, Congress has passed laws that have come back to haunt this generation and future generations, unless we act now. Republicans have divided these barriers that prevent Americans from keeping and creating jobs into eight categories. We have already acted on two of these categories. The first one was health care security. We have voted to limit health care costs and help provide health care security in America. This week we have dealt with the cost of bureaucratic red tape in our Bureaucratic Red Tape Termination group of bills, these five bills which I will discuss later on.

In the weeks that follow, House Republicans will bring up to the floor and vote on issues that address lifelong learning, so that we can have a skilled and talented workforce that focuses on math, science, and engineering skills.

We are going to deal with trade fairness and opportunity, so that we have fair trade policies to help assure jobs here in America. We are going to deal with tax relief and simplification so we can provide tax relief and tax simplification for Americans. We are going to move forward on an energy self-sufficiency and security plan. And we are going to encourage research and development by bringing legislation to the floor for research and development innovation. And we are going to end lawsuit abuse and deal with litigation management, which is the last issue we will deal with.

This is how we will make America more competitive. This is how we are going to ensure that our children and grandchildren have a strong economy, with opportunities to get a job if they want or start a business if they choose.

This week, we focused on bureaucratic red tape, and I want to read some facts. There are 65 words in The Lord's Prayer. There are 286 words in the Gettysburg Address. There are 1,322 words in the Declaration of Independence. And there are 26,911 words in the Federal regulation governing the sale of cabbage. This was made in a speech by FDIC Vice Chairman John M. Reich. He said this because he wanted to emphasize that bureaucratic red tape termination is vital for U.S. competitiveness in a global economy.

Bureaucratic red tape termination means less government not only by granting the freedom to allow Americans to pursue their dreams, but it also means providing space for businesses to thrive. Instead, our Federal Government has become a creeping ivy of regulations that strangle enterprise. Unrealistic, impractical, unnecessary environmental prohibitions, OSHA mandates and the like are literally driving our industries and small businesses and our health care system to a grinding halt.

How can we expect our economy to develop when bureaucracy prevents businesses from starting or expanding; when doctors cannot even keep up with the ever-changing codes, and teachers are forced to spend more time filling out paperwork than teaching in the classroom? The total compliance burden on our economy of environmental,

economic, workplace, and tax compliance regulations is $850 billion; $160 billion on manufacturers alone, which is the equivalent of a 12 percent excise tax.

Of the $860 billion, we can see in the chart that it is spread between four categories: tax compliance, the total is $132 billion; workplace compliance is $84 billion; environmental regulations are $201 billion; and economic regulatory costs are $444 billion.

Now, if we compare that $860 billion to the gross domestic product of Mexico, we can see that the $860 billion is higher than the $574 billion that is the entire gross national product of Mexico. Our regulatory burden is higher than the $701 billion, which is the entire gross national product of Canada. It is a tremendous burden on our businesses.

The regulatory costs compared with individual income taxes and corporate taxes and corporate pretax profits, here again is the $860 billion of regulatory costs, the total individual income taxes that were paid last year were $949 billion, the corporate income taxes were $201 billion, and the corporate profits were $699 billion. So we can see this is a tremendous regulatory burden on our businesses, and it is keeping us from creating and holding jobs here in America.

But the Bush administration has made great strides in curbing the growth of regulations and is making a concerted effort to review existing regulations to the extent possible. They have utilized the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and its administrator, Dr. John Graham, more than any other administration. We must support them in our efforts and encourage them to do even more.

Congress should also do a better job of oversight. Too often my colleagues and I are overburdened with committee work and we do not have the time or the staff to completely review how agencies operate within what cumbersome and unnecessary regulations they are placing on our citizens. I hope, myself, to work with leadership and refocus the committees' efforts to take time to review what is in place as we do the work that must be done immediately.

I have come up with a bill called CARFA, that I will explain more later, but it is called the Commission on Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies. It is a base realignment-type committee, a BRAC-like effort. BRAC was used for the military to determine which bases should be closed. CARFA would be used by this commission to find out which parts of the Federal Government should be closed, but I will explain more about that later.

House Republicans are taking on these problems of regulations and overburdening of rules. Over the last generation, legislation has been passed with good intentions, but the disastrous consequences have come in the form of these regulations and policies. These regulations and policies have made it difficult to stay competitive; and Congress, the Republicans in Congress, intend to do something about it.

We divided these into eight categories, and we are going to continue for the next 6 weeks, after we return from recess, to take one issue a week in order to reach the compliance that we need. Our goal is more high-quality, high-paying jobs today and for future generations.

The Heritage Foundation asserts that regulatory costs are killing our jobs. They say that reducing the regulatory burden would do much to speed the economic recovery and create jobs as well as help consumers. There are opportunities for reform in a number of areas, ranging from the burdensome telecommunication rules that are slowing progress for the next generation of Internet technologies, to unnecessary costly environmental regulations that make economic growth difficult. It goes to outdated workplace regulations that also discourage job creation.

OMB, or the Office of Management and Budget, recently reported to Congress that the annual cost to society of major Federal regulations, just issued between 1992 and 2002, in other words for a decade, are estimated to range between $38 billion and $44 billion. Now these are dollars that are going to compliance and not towards investment. This estimate suggests that Americans spend about $1.50 in compliance costs for every dollar in tax costs devoted to regulation.

For firms employing fewer than 20 employees, the annual regulatory burden in 2000 was estimated to be $6,975 per employee, nearly 60 percent higher than the $4,463 estimated for firms with more than 500 employees. In other words, it is the most difficult for small businesses.

□ 2130

Instead of spending more on wages or health care for these employees, they have to spend nearly $7,000 per employee just complying with the paperwork that the Federal Government requires.

Over the last decade, small firms have accounted for 60 to 80 percent of the net new jobs in the U.S. economy. During and coming out of the last two recession periods, 1990 through 1992, and 2000 through 2001, small businesses created all of the new net jobs.

According to the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, the budgetary cost to taxpayers for funding regulatory agencies topped $25 billion in 2002 alone. The Code of Federal Regulations extends 19 feet. If you can imagine that, that is more than three times my height. If it was stacked from the floor up towards the ceiling, 19 feet high. From 1991 to 2000, the number of pages in the Code of Federal Regulations increased 28 percent.

This Republican Congress has made regulatory reform a priority. It started back in the 104th Congress when we passed the Federal bureaucratic reforms under the Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act, which was part of the contract with America. That, among other things, has Federal agencies assess the risk and cost imposed by regulations.

To mark the passage of H.R. 1375, the Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act, had a myriad of bills and amendments that aimed at cutting red tape. According to the Congressional Research Service, the average number of rules issued each year, proposed and final, declined sharply during the Reagan administration, and dropped even further during the Bush administration, rose slightly during the Clinton administration, and has declined even further during the first 3 years of George W. Bush.

The average number of rules issued each year during the current Bush administration is 6,712. It is just over half as many issued, on average, each year during the Carter administration; that was 12,325. They have utilized the Office of Information Regulatory Affairs to do this through Dr. John Graham, and the U.S. Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy has gone out of its way to stand up for small businesses and encourage fellow agencies to reduce the red tape and the regulatory burdens.

Bolstered by the President's commitment to remove regulatory barriers that can stifle entrepreneurial growth and job creation, it has incorporated the views of small businesses into hundreds of agency decisions. Those efforts have changed regulations and curbed new mandates resulting in over $31 billion of savings. Those savings have been reinvested back into the economy, and we are starting to see the improvement with a number of jobs. I support the administration's efforts and encourage them to do more.

Let me talk about competitiveness, because compliance costs can be regarded as the silent killer of manufacturing competitiveness. According to the Heritage Foundation, a global CEO survey shows six of ten company heads view regulations as a serious threat to the growth of their business, topping exchange rates, corporate governance issues, and even terrorism. Small business is leading America's economic recovery, but an overwhelming burden of Federal paperwork rules and regulations threatens their competitiveness and their ability to spur job creation.

Regulation imposes its heaviest burden on small- and medium-sized businesses because it is even harder for them to handle the necessary paperwork and overhead costs, and the attorney and the accountant fees that go along with it. Richard Vedder, an economist at the Center For the Study of American Business, finds that Federal regulations cause $1.3 trillion in economic output to be lost each year.

In order to give an idea of what a trillion dollars is, let us assume you started a business the day after Christ

rose from the dead, and you made a million dollars that day and each day until today. In other words, your profit was a million dollars a day for nearly 2,000 years; by that time you would not yet have made a trillion dollars. You would only be three-quarters of the way to earning a trillion dollars.

So the cost of $1.3 trillion to economic output is a tremendous cost to our economy. This is roughly equivalent to the entire output of the Midatlantic region which includes Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

According to a study done by the Manufacturing Alliance, entitled ''How Structural Costs Imposed on U.S. Manufacturers Harm Workers and Threaten Competitiveness,'' in terms of compliance, three areas of regulation are hit particularly hard: consumer safety, workplace safety and environmental protection.

The total compliance burden is the $850 billion we have been talking about. And again, for manufacturers, that is equivalent to a 12 percent excise tax. That means we are 12 percent less competitive. If we could cut that in half, we could make ourselves 6 percent more competitive worldwide.

The burden on the pollution abatement expenditures alone reduces the cost of competitiveness by 3.5 percentage points, in comparison with our nine largest trading partners.

In a recent working paper by the Mercatus Center, which surveyed 100 manufacturing companies and estimated that the total cost of complying with the 25 statutes and executive orders, just 25 statutes and executive orders that encompass workplace regulation, it was about a $32 billion cost in the year 2000. That is equivalent to a 1.6 percent excise tax on manufactured goods.

In addition to the problem of adding to the number of uninsured and employers losing work due to the inability to provide coverage, health care costs are making America uncompetitive in the global market as well. While I do not advocate socialized medicine, most foreign nations provide health care coverage through their government and this is a huge cost that our companies have to worry about, but foreign companies do not have to worry about.

The National Association of Manufacturers calculated that the benefit costs put American companies at a 5.5 percent disadvantage compared to our nine largest trading partners. Not only does the United States spend more on health care annually, but 7.7 percent of our gross domestic product is the private sector contribution to health care coverage, and that far exceeds those of our foreign competitors. If we add the public sector to that, it is 14 percent of our gross domestic product.

America has been blessed with the best health care system. However, we must keep working to make it available and affordable, and the bureaucratic red tape tied to it is driving the cost of health care up. The Kansas Hospital Association has told me that for every hour of health care they provide, there is an additional hour required for paperwork compliance. We must improve access to health care and reduce the demands on paperwork so the quality of health care does not diminish.

Now, this week we have dealt with four OSHA bills and one paperwork reduction bill and we are committed, the Republicans are committed to reduce the cost of bureaucratic red tape. Congress established OSHA in 1970. OSHA, which is the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA's mandate was to ensure for all workers safe and healthful working conditions, I am quoting from the original law which says, ''by encouraging employers and employees in their efforts to reduce the number of occupational, safety and health hazards at their place of employment.''

Yet, unsurprisingly, OSHA's 30-year record has been marred by failure. According to the regulatory analysis performed by the Cato Institute, while OSHA's supporters cite evidence attesting to the agency's effectiveness, the vast majority of studies have found no statistical significance in the reduction of workplace fatalities or injuries due to OSHA. Interventionists are hard pressed to maintain that OSHA meets even the minimum criteria for any government program. That criteria is, does it have any desirable effect on the problem it is supposed to solve.

OSHA's failure has been bad for business. A 1995 study by the Employment Policy Foundation found that 19 percent of the productivity slow-downs in the 1970s was directly attributable to regulations imposed by OSHA, and nearly half of those slow-downs in long-term productivity can be explained by rising governmental regulatory activity.

OSHA's poor track record even forced Vice President Gore to admit that the agency ''does not work well enough.'' Yet despite its failures, OSHA continues to intimidate businesses with the heavy hand of regulation, and it continues to make us worse off. As with almost any form of persistent government meddling, regulation stifles the very forces that drive growth and enhance prosperity here at home.

OSHA was created to ensure a safe and healthy workplace for workers throughout our Nation. Over the past 30 years, America's workplace has become safer and more secure than any time in our history, much of it through initiatives through the private sector. But in the last 3 decades, OSHA has developed an affliction which many Federal agencies share. Those same Federal agencies, while created to do good, have become unwelcome visitors, bearing gifts such as regulation and misguided oversight. The affliction to which I am referring is an insatiable appetite for too much control of the day-to-day lives of American workers and the companies they have worked hard to build.

This is particularly true in the residential construction industry. A few months ago, OSHA seemed to unfairly target the residential industry in Sedgwick County, Kansas. In June, I was contacted by the home builders from Wichita who were terrified by the prospect of having to stop work in order to avoid fines by OSHA. OSHA had targeted three counties in Kansas and they flooded these OSHA employees into those areas.

My constituents told me that OSHA was planning to fine builders for having plastic coffee cups on the ground and workers' failure to wear ear plugs while operating a wet-vac. These fines could be as high as $50,000, and would effectively put these small businessmen out of business.

OSHA claimed these reports were exaggerated, but there is no way I can exaggerate the impact of OSHA's hostility and excessive regulation on the fragile economy in Wichita. Allow me to explain, and prevent further harm to the small business sector.

As the Air Capital of the World, nowhere else do you find so many top-name general aviation aircraft manufacturers located in such close proximity. We also manufacture structural components for large commercial airlines. It has been said that what Detroit is to the automobile and what Silicon Valley is to the computer chip, Wichita, Kansas, is to the airplane.

Wichita proudly claims as corporate residents the Boeing Company, Cessna, Raytheon, Bombardier Aerospace's Learjet division. As a result, Wichita supplies components of two-thirds of the world's commercial airlines and manufactures 60 percent of the world's general aviation aircraft.

As you are aware, the aviation industry is the first to feel the effects of an economic downturn and the last to recover from it, and that is exactly what happened after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Wichita and surrounding area lost more jobs as a percentage of the total number of jobs than any other community in the United States. That resulted in the layoff of over 12,000 aircraft manufacturing workers.

The last thing Wichita needs is a Federal agency running around harassing small business and operating as though it would rather push paper and impose fines than working with employers to create a safe and healthy work environment.

In the case of the residential construction companies, OSHA chose surprise visits, ill-conceived compliance guidelines, and an adversarial demeanor to achieve everyone's goal of a safer, more secure workplace. Many small contractors were forced to stop working in order to avoid unfair fines which could have been as much as $7,000 per infraction, no matter how insignificant the infraction was.

Under this approach, OSHA was doing more to hurt employees than to help them by threatening the ability of the men and women in the residential construction industry to make a living. The work environment was safer; it was safe because there was nobody there. They were afraid to go to the work site in fear of being find by OSHA.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has been a leader in the fight to keep American businesses competitive without sacrificing workplace safety and health protections. As a part of our Bureaucratic Red Tape Reduction Week, the gentleman brought to the floor this week several bills which are aimed at establishing the basic principles of fairness, reducing regulatory burdens and expediting administrative reviews that will increase business productivity among America's small businesses.

□ 2145

These four bills are H.R. 2728, the Occupational and Safety Health Small Business Day in Court Act; H.R. 2729, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission Efficiency Act; H.R. 2730, the Occupational Safety and Health Independent Review of OSHA Citations Act; and H.R. 2731, the Occupational Safety and Health Small Employer Access to Justice Act. I am pleased to say that the House passed all four measures despite overwhelming Democratic opposition to the measures.

As we continue to focus on Bureaucratic Red Tape Termination week, I would like to share with my colleagues legislation that I will be introducing to assist small businesses in their latest battle against Big Government. My legislation accomplishes five goals. First, the bill will streamline the amount of time businesses have to contest citations and the amount of time OSHA has to issue citations. Today, businesses have 15 days to contest citations while OSHA has 6 months to issue them. Under my bill, OSHA will have 30 days to issue citations and provide employers with 30 days to contest it.

Secondly, this legislation allows businesses the right to correct OSHA violations without immediate monetary penalty. Under my plan, safety would be improved because employers would be given the incentive to promptly correct conditions that violate OSHA standards, except in the case of willful violations where the employer had knowledge of the violation and made no reasonable effort to correct it.

This section of the bill would give employers 72 hours to correct a violation following an OSHA inspection. Once corrected, the employer must provide an abatement certification to OSHA of the correction. Upon completion of the correction and certification, OSHA would not issue a monetary penalty for the citation, although the citation would be kept on record.

Third, my bill addresses the multi-employer citation policy issue by more narrowly defining the multi-employer citation policy at OSHA.

OSHA's recent enforcement of this policy has potentially overstepped their statutory authority that was authorized by Congress in the Occupational Safety and Heath Act. The legislation that I will be proposing clarifies to whom OSHA can issue citations on work sites where multiple employers are operating and allows OSHA to issue citations for a violation only to the employer who has exposed their employee to that given condition.

Fourth, my legislation will change the criteria for issuing subsequent repeat citations by stating that ''other than serious'' citations cannot be used as a basis for repeat or subsequent citations.

Finally, the bill will require OSHA inspectors to provide to employers a written statement or summary at the conclusion of the inspection that lists the items which OSHA inspectors noticed during the inspection. OSHA must then use these summary items as the basis for their citations. Requiring a summary at the end of the inspection would provide employers with prompt notification of hazardous conditions on their job site, thereby improving safety on the work site by providing employers with the opportunity to correct hazardous conditions immediately.

Currently, employers are often unaware of what the inspector's concerns were until they receive the citation, sometimes up to 6 months after the inspection. The bill also includes the added benefit of providing OSHA with the incentive to ensure that their inspectors are well versed and educated on OSHA regulations prior to conducting the site inspection.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that OSHA's first approach to those who provide jobs in our communities should be cooperative and not combative. This agency should be driven to work with, and not against, America's businesses.

Since 1971, OSHA's safety guidelines have accomplished some decline in occupational injuries and illness rates, and workplace fatalities have been cut in half. And I am convinced that it is possible to continue job protection for the American worker while at the same time create a climate for more jobs and economic growth.

The fifth bill that was passed this week to reduce bureaucratic red tape and paperwork was called the Paperwork and Regulatory Improvements Act. It was H.R. 2432, and it requires the Office of Management and Budget, in concert with the Internal Revenue Service, to conduct a review and then report to Congress on possible actions to reduce tax paperwork burden imposed on small businesses. H.R. 2432 provides Congress with a needed permanent analytic capability to serve as a check and balance on the executive branch's cost-benefit estimates of its proposed and final regulations and their consistency with congressional intent. Under the current law, OMB is required to submit an annual regulatory accounting statement with the President's fiscal budget.

To date, the usefulness of these reports has been undermined since they have not been integrated with the budget. In other words, they do not permit Congress to review simultaneously the on-budget and off-budget costs associated with each Federal agency and each Federal agency program that imposes regulatory or paperwork burdens on the public. H.R. 2432 improves the utility of these reports to Congress by ensuring we have this simultaneous review.

Currently, there is no end to regulatory burdens imposed on the public including both large and small businesses, but H.R. 2432 requires the first-ever multi-agency study of regulatory budgeting to determine if agencies can better manage regulatory burdens on the public. This is a good government bill which makes incremental improvements in the existing processes governing paperwork and regulatory reviews, including strengthening tools for those of us here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I also want to discuss another tool that I think can be used in eliminating unwanted and unneeded regulation and regulatory bodies in our Federal Government, and that is the creation of the Commission on the Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies or CARFA.

It is certainly no secret that the Federal budget is filled with examples of duplicative, inefficient, and failed Federal agencies and programs. Many of these programs and agencies share regulatory oversight which very often ties the hands of businesses and employers due to the outrageous compliance costs these businesses must bear. I have introduced legislation that I believe would eliminate much of the fraud, abuse, and unnecessary regulation that persists in our Federal Government in a politically visible manner.

It has become increasingly clear that Congress's normal procedures cannot address the spending and waste problems that persist within our Federal Government. Time and again we see congressionally authorized programs become institutionalized, ultimately becoming a permanent fixture at the expense of taxpayers. This ties up precious Federal resources that could be used towards paying down the national debt or higher congressional priorities. By cutting out unnecessary Federal programs and agencies, we will send a strong message that we are serious about exercising fiscal responsibility and controlling government spending.

A first step towards a stable financial future for this country certainly can be found in H.R. 3213, the CARFA bill, which is also known as the Commission on the Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies Act. CARFA is based on a process with an established record of successful program elimination and

prioritizing of spending. The Base Realignment and Closure Commission, or BRAC as it is called, is similar only it deals strictly with military bases, whereas H.R. 3213 will establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and recommend the elimination or the realignment of duplicative, wasteful, and outdated functions.

CARFA provides for a disciplined spending review process for nondefense, nonentitlement programs. Congress will simply have to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations in their entirety. The congressional logrolling that normally bogs down the process will be short-circuited. In this way, real reform can emerge and the deficit and debt program can be brought under control. H.R. 3213 offers Congress and the administration a unique opportunity rather than simply re-fund and increase funding for every Federal program. CARFA will eliminate unproductive, duplicative, and outdated programs.

Here is how CARFA would work. The commission would consist of 12 members appointed by the President no later than 90 days after the enactment of this bill. Members would be appointed for the life of the commission and would be required to meet no later than 30 days after the date on which all the members of the commission have been appointed. CARFA's duties would then include conducting a top to bottom review of all Federal programs and agencies, excepting the Department of Defense and any agency that solely administers entitlement programs.

CARFA would seek to identify those programs or agencies that could be considered duplicative in mission, grossly wasteful or inefficient, outdated, irrelevant, or simply failed. The assessment of these programs would be based primarily on the achievement of common performance measures, financial management, and other factors determined by the President. No later than 2 years after the enactment of this act, the commission would be required to submit to the President and Congress a plan with recommendations of the agencies and programs that should be realigned or eliminated and propose legislation to implement this plan. CARFA would require congressional consideration of the review's findings under the expedited legislative rules. In short, Congress would be voting up or down to continue or stop wasteful spending.

CARFA's main focus would be to make our government smarter and more effective and also to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to support programs such as the Federal Teataster, who until 1995 headed the Board of Tea Experts, which was created by the Imported Tea Act of 1897. Until this program's elimination just 8 short years ago, the Federal Government was spending $120,000 in salary and operating expenses per year to taste tea.

Obviously, this is only one example of the type of program that CARFA would target, but I am convinced that our Federal Government is replete with programs such as this that make a mockery out of our hard-earned tax dollars and that dramatically increase the costs of doing business in this country. Other examples of government waste that CARFA would target include surplus lands owned by the Department of Energy, which if sold would save taxpayers $12 million over 5 years. In addition, eliminating four duplicative bilingual education programs at the Department of Education would save taxpayers $800 million over a 5-year period. We could save $1 million every year by simply eliminating overlapping responsibilities and reducing administrative positions at the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The examples of inefficiency and wasteful government practices that CARFA could target are far too numerous to cite in this short amount of time. However, it is clear to me that the need for CARFA is very real.

The strict time limits governing the commission which would expire shortly after submitting its findings would ensure that its costs are kept to a minimum. I believe that the savings that would occur as a result of the commission's findings will more than justify the minimal expenses the study might incur. In addition, it is worth noting that CARFA requires that all funds saved by implementation of this plan can only, only, be used for supporting other domestic programs or paying down the national debt.

H.R. 3213 offers Congress and the administration a test: Can we address a real and present problem by adopting a method that has been successful in the past? CARFA is a realistic plan that will make genuine reform possible. We welcome support of this politically viable solution to government spending gone awry. If the CARFA commission comes to fruition, it will give Congress arms-length distance to do the right thing and vote down ridiculous, redundant, and outdated programs. Over 65 of my colleagues in the House have agreed to cosponsor this legislation, and our numbers are growing stronger. We hope to see the CARFA commission hard at work cutting wasteful spending and eliminating burdensome overregulation by this time next year if not sooner.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that, over the last generation, Congress through good intentions has created barriers to keeping and creating jobs in America. Republicans in the House have come up with a plan of dividing these barriers into eight issues, and over a period of 8 weeks we are going to address each one of these issues with the purpose of creating high-quality, high-paying jobs right here in America and bringing jobs home, jobs that we have lost due to the acts of Congress and the regulations and policies and rules that have followed these acts of Congress.

Again, Mr. Speaker, those eight issues are health care security, bureaucratic red tape termination, lifelong learning, trade fairness and opportunity, tax relief and simplification, energy self-sufficiency and security, spurring innovation, and ending lawsuit abuse.

□ 2200

Last week we dealt with health care security by passing health care liability reform and by passing Flexible Savings Accounts and Medical Savings Accounts.

This week we have dealt with bureaucratic red tape termination. We passed four bills relating to OSHA and the Paperwork and Regulatory Improvement Act 2030.

Next week we are in recess, so the following week we are going to deal with lifelong learning. It is our intent during that week to focus on those types of training and education that we believe will bring more jobs into America. We want to focus on math, on science, on engineering. We want to develop a system where we can teach our young men and women to be technical in their training, so they can be innovative and ready to accept the jobs that will be created by reducing these other burdens. So lifelong learning will be the week next after we are on recess.

So, Mr. Speaker, these eight issues are going to be dealt with. They are not easily overcome by businesses, small and large, because they are things they cannot control. Businesses can control wages, they can control overhead, but they cannot control their health care costs, they cannot control the bureaucratic red tape that burdens them down every day, they cannot control the trade issues and policies, they cannot control the energy policy we have and they cannot control the lawsuits that come and haunt them. So we intend to address these issues.

This is the debate that we should be having on the floor of the House now. This is how we are going to secure a future for our children and our grandchildren. We are going to, if successful, create a strong economy in the future, where they can either start a business or get a job.

For those who are in opposition to these issues, I want to ask you, why would you oppose an energy policy that would create 700,000 more jobs in America? Why would you oppose reducing red tape so we can create additional work in areas where we do not have jobs now? Why would you want to oppose lawsuit reform, because right now it is driving jobs overseas?

The Republicans in the House want to bring jobs back into America. This is our plan. It is the most aggressive and organized plan that we have ever had for bringing jobs back to America. I am very proud to head up this effort through a Jobs Action Team.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are going to be successful in bringing jobs back.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8226. A letter from the Congressional Review Corrdinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Orchids of the Genus Phalaenopsis From Taiwan in Growing Media [Docket No. 98-035-5] (RIN: 0579-AB75) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8227. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Diagnostic Services User Fees [Docket No. 00-024-2] (RIN: 0579-AB22) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8228. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle; Additions to Quatantined Areas [Docket No. 03-102-2] received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8229. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyard Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services (RIN: 0580-AA80) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8230. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Karnal Bunt; Compensation for Custom Harvesters in Northern Texas [Docket No. 03-052-1] received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8231. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Isoxadifen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0093; FRL-7355-8] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8232. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Indoxacarb; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0130; FRL-7359-1] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8233. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the 2003 Annual Report on United Nations voting practices, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2414a; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8234. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA 169-0440a; FRL-7665-2] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8235. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California and Nevada State Implementation Plans, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District and Clark County Departemnt of Air Quality Management [CA 151-0449a; FRL-7660-6] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8236. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Finding of Failure to Submit Required State Implementation Plan Revision for the Metropolitan Washington, DC Ozone Nonattainment Area; Maryland [MD168-3110; FRL-7665-6] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8237. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL221-1a; FRL-7657-8] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8238. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program [Region II Docket No. NJ68-275; FRL-7661-1] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8239. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN 140-4a; FRL-7658-9] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8240. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; The 2005 ROP Plan for the Pennsylvania Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton Severe Area Sever 1-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area: [PA213-4026; FRL-7663-7] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8241. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Missouri Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [MO-194-1194; FRL-7658-5] received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective April 18, 2004, the 15% Danger Pay Allowance for Sierra Leone was terminated based on improved security conditions and the fact that warfare conditions have ceased, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

8243. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective March 7, 2004, a 15% Danger Pay Allowance for Haiti has been established based on the threat of attacks on U.S. facilities endangering the lives of U.S. Governemnt civilians, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

8244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning Cuban emigration policies, pursuant to Public Law 105—277, section 2245; to the Committee on International Relations.

8245. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to the Anti-Economic Discrimination Act of 1994, part C of Title V, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, as amended (Public Law 103-236), the Secretary's determination suspending prohibitions on certain sales and leases under the Anti-Economic Discrimination Act of 1994 and the accompanying Memorandum of Justification; to the Committee on International Relations.

8246. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act, the Foundation's quarterly financial statement, prepared by the U.S. General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8247. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Army's Annual Financial Statement for FY 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8248. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notice that in compliance with the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002, the Office of Insepctor General has initiated the audit of the Department of Homeland Security's consolidated financial statements as of and for the year ending September 30, 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8249. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act (No Fear Act), the Department's annual report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8250. A letter from the President, Federal Financing Bank, transmitting the Annual Management Report of the Federal Financing Bank for fiscal year 2003, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8251. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Authority's first annual report, pursuant to Public Law 107–174, section 203(a); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8252. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington D.C., on September 23, 2003, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8253. A letter from the Secretary to the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Resolution 15-514, ''Sense of the Council on Opposing a Constitutional Marriage Amendment Resolution of 2004,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8254. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report on Denial of Visas to Confiscators of American Property, pursuant to Public Law 105–277, section 8; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8255. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting as conducted by the United States Coast Guard, a report on Safety Management Code Report & Policy, pursuant to Public Law 105–383, section 306; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8256. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, VA. [CGD05-04-081] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8257. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Metro North Railroad Bridge over the Norwalk

River, Norwalk, Connecticut [CGD01-04-035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8258. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security and Safety Zone; M/V Spirit of Ontario, Lake Ontario, NY [CGD09-04-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8259. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; McCellan-Kerr Arkansas River Mile 307 to 309.5, Fort Smith, AR [COTP Memphis-04-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8260. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Transit of Rig Pride Portland, Portland, Maine [CGD01-04-040] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8261. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Snake River, Burbank, WA [CGD13-04-004] received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8262. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Illinois Waterway, Joliet, IL [CGD08-04-016] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8263. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Stono River, mile 11.0 at Johns Island, SC. [CGD07-04-021] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8264. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Newtown Creek, Dutch Kills, English Kills, and their tributaries, NY. [CGD01-04-039] received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8265. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Galveston, TX. [CGD08-04-017] received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8266. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Loxahatchee River, Palm Beach County, FL [CGD07-04-019] received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8267. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mare Island Strait, Napa River, Vallego, CA. [CGD11-03-006] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8268. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, miles 1062.6 and 1064.0 in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FL. [CGD07-03-166] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8269. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area; USCG Station Port Huron, Port Huron, Michigan, Lake Huron [CGD09-03-287] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8270. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Coast Guard Station Fire Island, Fire Island, NY [CGD01-03-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8271. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Update of Rules on Aids to Navigation Affecting Buoys, Sound Signals, International Rules at Sea, Communications Procedures, and Large Navigational Buoys [USCG-2001-10714] (RIN: 1625-AA34) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8272. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) Decision, pursuant to Public Law 108—170, section 222; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8273. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2001 report entitled, ''Implementation of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act'' required under Section 23(a)(2) of the Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

8274. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report on the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs' administration of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 222 (EEOICPA) analyzing claims for benefits under the EEOICPA that have been either accepted or denied through December 31, 2003, pursuant to Public Law 108–136, section 3134; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and the Workforce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 4200. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–491 Pt. 2).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1301. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit video voyeurism in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1678. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to false communications about certain criminal violations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2991. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional recycling project and in the Cucamonga County Water District recycling project (Rept. 108–506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3378. A bill to assist in the conservation of marine turtles and the nesting habitats of marine turtles in foreign countries (Rept. 108–507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1014. A bill to require Federal land managers to support, and to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with, designated gateway communities, to improve the ability of gateway communities to participate in Federal land management planning conducted by the Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior, and to respond to the impacts of the public use of the Federal lands administered by these agencies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–508 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3846. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement or contract with Indian tribes meeting certain criteria to carry out projects to protect Indian forest land; with an amendment (Rept. 108–509 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3504. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to redesignate the American Indian Education Foundation as the National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education (Rept. 108–510 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3874. A bill to convey for public purposes certain Federal lands in Riverside County, California, that have been identified for disposal; with an amendment (Rept. 108–512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2966. A bill to preserve the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on public lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, administered by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service where there is a historical tradition of such use, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–513 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3247.

## REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3247. A bill to provide consistent enforcement authority to the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service to respond to violations of regulations regarding the management, use, and protection of public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies, the clarify the purposes for which collected fines may be used, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than June 30, 2004, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(k), rule X (Rept. 108–511, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2966. Referral to the Committee on Agriculture extended for a period ending not later than June 30, 2004.

H.R. 3247. Referral to the Committee on Agriculture extended for a period ending not later than May 20, 2004.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 4409. A bill to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KELLER, Mr. COLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H.R. 4410. A bill to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for highly qualified teachers in mathematics, science, and special education and for reading specialists; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4411. A bill to amend title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure graduate opportunities in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4412. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to clarify the application of the antitrust laws in the telecommunications industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 4413. A bill to require certain terms and conditions for the siting, construction, expansion, and operation of liquefied natural gas import terminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida (for himself, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H.R. 4414. A bill to require designation of a senior official within the Office of Management and Budget as the Chief Privacy Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 4415. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the ''specialized knowledge'' basis for obtaining nonimmigrant status as an intracompany transferee, to impose an annual numerical limitation on nonimmigrant visas for such transferees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 4416. A bill to establish the Great Lakes Protection and Restoration Committee; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COX, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 4417. A bill to modify certain deadlines pertaining to machine-readable, tamper-resistant entry and exit documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 4418. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2005 and 2006 for the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4419. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for wildland firefighting costs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. AKIN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. TOOMEY):

H.R. 4420. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are fully informed regarding the pain experienced by their unborn child; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 4421. A bill making appropriations for the Environmental Protection Agency for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 4422. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, and Transportation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4423. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4424. A bill making appropriations for military construction and family housing for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 4425. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the Purple Heart to be awarded to prisoners of war who die in captivity under circumstances not otherwise establishing eligibility for the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4426. A bill to prohibit certain entities from trading in capital markets in the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. QUINN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 4427. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73 South Euclid Avenue in Montauk, New York, as the ''Perry B. Duryea, Jr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 4428. A bill to extend trade benefits to certain tents imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for wage parity for prevailing rate employees in Guam; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CHOCOLA (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in legal fees payable in civil diversity litigation after an offer of settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 4431. A bill to provide for competitive grants for the establishment and expansion of programs that use networks of public, private, and faith-based organizations to recruit and train foster and adoptive parents and provide support services to foster children and their families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 4432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for qualified long-term care insurance premiums, use of such insurance under cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and a credit for individuals with long-term care needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 4433. A bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4434. A bill to improve the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable wage differential credit for activated military reservists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTSCH (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 4436. A bill to reform and improve certain housing programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 4437. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for low-income beneficiaries in the Medicare savings programs automatic enrollment and eligibility for low-income subsidies under the Medicare transitional and permanent prescription drug programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BALLANCE, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 4438. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend from two years to five years the eligibility of veterans who served in recent hostilities for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care for any illness; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 4439. A bill to require the release of the reversionary interest retained by the United States in connection with the conveyance of portions of former Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, to Arizona State University and Maricopa County Community College District; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4440. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to render proof of possession by an alien of a consular identification card issued by a foreign mission prima facie evidence that the alien is deportable, to render inadmissible for 10 years any alien who is unlawfully present in the United States and presents such a card to satisfy a Federal identification-related requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 4441. A bill to reform and improve the rental housing voucher program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. PORTER, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 4442. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1050 North Hills Boulevard in Reno, Nevada, as the ''Guardians of Freedom Memorial Post Office Building'' and to authorize the installation of a plaque at such site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 4443. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to extend the authorization of appropriations for the historic preservation fund; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish a Personal Reemployment Accounts pilot grant program to assist Americans in returning to work; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4445. A bill to waive the time limitation specified by law for the award of certain military decorations in order to allow the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Doris Miller for actions while a member of the Navy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 4446. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to reform funding for the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 4447. A bill to revise the boundary of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 4448. A bill to require the President to seek the establishment of an international commission for monitoring the treatment of persons in United States custody in Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 4449. A bill to provide assistance to combat HIV/AIDS in the Republic of India, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 4450. A bill to authorize the Government of Ukraine to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor the victims of the Ukrainian famine-genocide of 1932-1933; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4451. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to correct the definition of certain non-knit gloves designed for use in sports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 4452. A bill to require funds made available to each Federal department and agency for United States development or humanitarian assistance programs to be made available to foreign countries through the activities of United States organizations or businesses that are owned or controlled by naturalized United States citizens, or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who are from those foreign countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 4453. A bill to improve access to physicians in medically underserved areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT:

H.R. 4454. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect and promote the public safety and interstate commerce by establishing Federal criminal penalties and civil remedies for certain violent, threatening, obstructive, and destructive conduct that is intended to injure, intimidate, or interfere with plant or animal enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4455. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of certain factors with respect to any aspect of a surety bond transaction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 4456. A bill to require labeling of raw agricultural forms of ginseng, including the country of harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 4457. A bill to require congressional renewal of trade and travel restrictions on Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 4458. A bill to require the repayment of appropriated funds that are illegally disbursed for political purposes by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 4459. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and in coordination with other Federal, State, and local government agencies, to participate in the funding and implementation of a balanced, long-term groundwater remediation program in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 4460. A bill to fulfill the United States Government's trust responsibility to serve the educational needs of the Navajo people; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RENZI:

H.R. 4461. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly conduct a study of certain land adjacent to the Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SANDLIN (for himself and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 4462. A bill making appropriations for homeland security programs within the Departments of Energy, Health and Human Services, and Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 4463. A bill to provide for identification of members of the Armed Forces exposed during military service to depleted uranium, to provide for health testing of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

H.R. 4464. A bill to improve the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STENHOLM:

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend loan forgiveness for certain loans to certified or licensed teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 4466. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to exclude the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse from lists of endangered species and threatened species published under that Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HILL, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CASE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4467. A bill to establish reporting requirements relating to funds made available for military operations in Iraq or for the reconstruction of Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY (for himself, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. SANDLIN):

H.R. 4468. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, and title 10, United States Code, to provide for an opportunity for active duty personnel to withdraw an election not to participate in the program of educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 4469. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for the restoration of the Angel Island Immigration Station in the State of California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DELAY:

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LEE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Con. Res. 433. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Republic of India on the conduct of its recent democratic national elections; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Con. Res. 434. Concurrent resolution commending the persons who were inducted for service in the United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H. Con. Res. 435. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Celiac Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 436. Concurrent resolution celebrating 10 years of majority rule in the Republic of South Africa and recognizing the momentous social and economic achievements of South Africa since the institution of democracy in that country; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H. Con. Res. 437. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should request Taiwan's President Chen Shui-bian to deploy Taiwanese Marines to Iraq to join international Coalition forces in the global war on terrorism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the crew of the U.S.S. Pittsburgh for their heroism in March 1945 for rendering aid and assistance to the U.S.S. Franklin and its crew; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HASTERT (for himself, Mr. DELAY, and Ms. PELOSI):

H. Res. 651. A resolution expressing the gratitude of the House of Representatives to its Parliamentarian, the Honorable Charles W. Johnson, III; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 652. A resolution urging the Government of the Republic of Belarus to ensure a democratic, transparent, and fair election process for its parliamentary elections in the fall of 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H. Res. 653. A resolution honoring former President George Herbert Walker Bush on the occasion of his 80th birthday; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H. Res. 654. A resolution recognizing the 38th anniversary of the independence of Guyana and extending best wishes to Guyana for peace and further progress, development, and

prosperity; to the Committee on International Relations.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

332. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 123 memorializing the federal government to conduct a thorough evaluation of the condition of the 187-acre property situated in Waikane Valley that was used by the United States Marine Corps for ordnance training until 1976, plan for and coduct as thorough a clean-up and removal of ordnance as is technologically possible, conduct an environmental assessment of the potential risk to human health and safety, and return the land to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

333. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 77 supporting the Employee Free Choice Act (S. 1925 and H.R. 3619); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

334. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1464, Joint Resolutoin memorializing the Congress of teh United States to support the Farm-to-Cafeteria Projects Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

335. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 87 recognizing Native Hawaiians as traditional, indigenous knowledge holders and recognizing their collective intellectual property rights; to the Committee on Resources.

336. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 51 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to support the passage of H.R. 3587 into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

337. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 585 memorializing the United States Congress to amend 42 U.S.C. 14132(a)(1) to allow the inclusion in CODIS of DNA profiles of ''other persons, whose DNA samples are collected under applicable legal authorities''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

338. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 114 memorializing the United States Congress to support the passage of S. 68 to improve benefits for certain Filipino veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

339. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 24 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to repeal the restriction on the government to negotiate reductions in prescription drug prices with manufacturers; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

340. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 66 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to release first responder funds to municipalities; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 236: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 296: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 371: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 442: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 586: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 625: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 677: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 716: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 727: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 742: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 745: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 785: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 792: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BURR, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 814: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 823: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 832: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 847: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 852: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 857: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 883: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 918: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 934: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 953: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1034: Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1160: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1191: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1306: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1316: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1406: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1470: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1639: Mr. HOEFFEL and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1684: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1689: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1716: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1735: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1736: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1742: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1745: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1746: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1800: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1818: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 1863: Mr. CLAY and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1919: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1930: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2037: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2101: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2133: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2217: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2237: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 2239: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 2256: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2262: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2265: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2345: Mr. CASE and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 2353: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2387: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2394: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. STARK, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. WATSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2442: Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2490: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2497: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2598: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2747: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 2811: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2890: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 2935: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2950: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2963: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 2967: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2968: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2978: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 3069: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 3142: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3178: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3193: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 3194: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 3250: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3292: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3310: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 3323: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3324: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3352: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3425: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3441: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 3446: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3459: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3474: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 3479: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 3480: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. REYES, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 3483: Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FROST, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 3507: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3523: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3543: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 3579: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3591: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3602: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 3619: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3641: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 3729: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3764: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3777: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3795: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3801: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 3802: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3803: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 3815: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3831: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3880: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 3929: Mr. FROST, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 3933: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 3972: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3982: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 4026: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4035: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4051: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4064: Mr. BURNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 4067: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 4091: Mr. AKIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4113: Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 4116: Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WU, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REYES, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HALL, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 4117: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 4126: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 4149: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 4177: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 4182: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 4203: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 4207: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4210: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 4230: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 4231: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4232: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HALL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TURNER of Texas, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4249: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4256: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4260: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 4278: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURNS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4313: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 4316: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4325: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4334: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 4341: Mr. POMEROY and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 4345: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4346: Mr. BERRY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SABO, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 4348: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. REYES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4349: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4356: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4359: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 4361: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 4363: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. INSLEE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 4370: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4377: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 4380: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 4391: Mr. CARTER, MS. GRANGER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NEUGEGAUER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 72: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 95: Mr. FORD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 93: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 182: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 197: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 242: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 252: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 298: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 310: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 366: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 375: Mr. FILNER, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. HARMAN and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 392: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 405: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 413: Mr. SHAW, Mr. WEXLER and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 418: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 60: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 542: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 567: Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. REHBERG.

H. Res. 570: Mr. WYNN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 586: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 604: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 611: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 633: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Res. 646: Mr. COOPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Res. 647: Mr. PORTER.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3473: Mr. HOLDEN.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Joe Sitting Owl White, Principal Chief, Cherokee of Lawrence County, Tennessee, relative to petitioning the United States Congress for redress of grievances; to the Committee on Resources.

82. Also, a petition of Mr. Dwight E. Walker, a Citizen of Texas, relative to an affidavit of pertinent facts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

83. Also, a petition of the Governor of Kentucky, relative to a letter petitioning for the extension of funding for high risk pools under the Trade Act of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# *Daily Digest*

**HIGHLIGHTS:**

**Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 432, Adjournment Resolution.**

**The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 651, expressing the gratitude of the House of Representatives to its Parliamentarian, the Honorable Charles W. Johnson.**

**The House passed H.R. 4200, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2005.**

**The House passed H.R. 4359, Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004.**

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

***Routine Proceedings, pages S5893–S6049***

**Measures Introduced:** Twenty-two bills were introduced as follows: S. 2451–2472. **Pages S5949–50**

**Measures Reported:**

S. 1687, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the preservation and interpretation of the historic sites of the Manhattan Project for potential inclusion in the National Park System, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 108–270)

S. 1778, to authorize a land conveyance between the United States and the City of Craig, Alaska, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 108–271)

S. 1791, to amend the Lease Lot Conveyance Act of 2002 to provide that the amounts received by the United States under that Act shall be deposited in the reclamation fund. (S. Rept. No. 108–272)

H. Con. Res. 409, recognizing with humble gratitude the more than 16,000,000 veterans who served in the United States Armed Forces during World War II and the Americans who supported the war effort on the home front and celebrating the completion of the National World War II Memorial on the National Mall in the District of Columbia.

S. Res. 362, expressing the sense of the Senate on the dedication of the National World War II Memorial on May 29, 2004, in recognition of the duty, sacrifices, and valor of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in World War II.

S. 1933, to promote effective enforcement of copyrights, with amendments.

S. 2453, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to award grants to public transportation agencies to improve security. **Pages S5948–49**

**Measures Passed:**

***Adjournment Resolution:*** Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 432, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. **Page S6044**

***National Transportation Week:*** Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 420, applauding the men and women who keep America moving and recognizing National Transportation Week, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6044**

***National Better Hearing and Speech Month:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 366, supporting May 2004 as National Better Hearing and Speech Month and commending those States that have implemented routine hearing screenings for every newborn before the newborn leaves the hospital. **Pages S6044–45**

***Older Americans Month:*** Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 353, designating May 2004, as "Older Americans Month", and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6045**

***Honoring Mildred McWilliams:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 367, honoring the life of Mildred

McWilliams "Millie" Jeffrey (1910–2004) and her contributions to her community and to the United States. **Pages S6045–47**

***Honoring Members of the Armed Forces:*** Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 424, honoring past and current members of the Armed Forces of the United States and encouraging Americans to wear red poppies on Memorial Day. **Page S6047**

**Measures Passed—Correction:** The Daily Digest of Wednesday, May 19, 2004, incorrectly carried the passage of H.R. 3505, to amend the Bend Pine Nursery Land Conveyance Act to specify the recipients and consideration for conveyance of the Bend Pine Nursery. (H.R. 3505 remains pending on the Senate Calendar.)

**Department of Defense Authorization Act:** Senate continued consideration of S. 2400, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Services, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5902–25, S5929–34**

Pending:

Graham (SC) Amendment No. 3170, to provide for the treatment by the Department of Energy of waste material. **Pages S5903–07, S5909–25**

Crapo Amendment No. 3226 (to Amendment No. 3170), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5907**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 9:30 a.m., on Friday, May 21, 2004.

**Federal Highway Reauthorization—Conferees:** Pursuant to the order of May 19, 2004, regarding H.R. 3550, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, the Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Inhofe, Warner, Bond, Voinovich, Grassley, Hatch, Nickles, Lott, Shelby, McCain, McConnell, Jeffords, Reid (NV), Graham (FL), Lieberman, Boxer, Daschle, Hollings, Sarbanes, Baucus, and Conrad. **Page S6047**

**Messages From the President:** Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency protecting the Development Fund for Iraq and certain other property in which Iraq has an interest; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–78) **Page S5946**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, the United States Arctic Research Plan; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs. (PM–79) **Page S5946**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2004 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy for Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM–80) **Page S5946**

**Nominations Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 97 yeas 1 nay (Vote No. Ex. 102), Raymond W. Gruender, of Missouri, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit. **Pages S5926–28**

By unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. Ex. 103), Franklin S. Van Antwerpen, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit. **Pages S5928–29**

**Nominations Received:** Senate received the following nominations:

Edwin D. Williamson, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics for a term of five years.

Mark D. Gearan, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of one year. (New Position)

Leona White Hat, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2008.

Milton Aponte, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Council On Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2006. (Reappointment)

Robert Davila, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council On Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2006. (Reappointment)

Young Woo Kang, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2006. (Reappointment)

Kathleen Martinez, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2006. (Reappointment)

Linda Wetters, of Ohio, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2006. (Reappointment)

Laura A. Cordero, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Juliet JoAnn McKenna, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Robert Clark Corrente, of Rhode Island, to be United States Attorney for the District of Rhode Island for the term of four years.

Routine lists in the Army, Marine Corps, Navy. **Pages S6047–49**

**Messages From the House:** **Page S5946**

**Measures Placed on Calendar:** **Page S5947**

**Measures Read First Time:** **Page S5947**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S5947–48**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Page S5949**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S5950–51**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Pages S5951–S6011**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S5945–46**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Pages S6011–16**

**Authority for Committees to Meet:** **Page S6016**

**Record Votes:** Two record votes were taken today. (Total—103) **Page S5928, S5929**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 10 a.m., and adjourned at 7:39 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, May 21, 2004. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6047.)

# *Committee Meetings*

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

## EXTENDED CUSTODIAL INVENTORY PROGRAM

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Reserve's Extended Custodial Inventory Program (ECI), focusing on recent events involving the Union Bank of Switzerland-Zurich which violated its ECI Agreement with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York by engaging in U.S. dollar banknote transactions with countries subject to sanctions by the U.S. Department of Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control, which administers and enforces economic sanctions against targeted foreign countries, after receiving testimony from R. Richard Newcomb, Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury; and Thomas C. Baxter, Jr., Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York City.

## CAN–SPAM ACT REVIEW

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the implementation of the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act (CAN–SPAM Act) (P.L. 108–187), focusing on new federal efforts to address unsolicited commercial email (''spam'') to better protect consumers and businesses, after receiving testimony from Timothy Muris, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Jana D. Monroe, Assistant Director, Cyber Division, and Dan Larkin, Unit Chief, Internet Crime Complaint Center, both of Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Ted Leonsis, America Online, Inc., Dulles, Virginia; Shinya Akamine, Postini, Inc., Redwood City, California; Hans Peter Brondmo, Digital Impact, Inc., San Mateo, California; James Guest, Consumers Union, Yonkers, New York; and Ronald Scelson, MicroEvolutions.com, Montgomery, Texas.

## NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 1672, to expand the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve, Florida, S. 1789 and H.R. 1616, bills to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site for lands owned by the City of Atlanta, Georgia, S. 2167, to establish the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park in the States of Washington and Oregon, and S. 2173, to further the purposes of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2000, after receiving testimony from Paul Hoffman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks; Steve Brady, Sr., Northern Cheyenne Sand Creek Descendants, Lame Deer, Montana; Carol J. Alexander, Ritz Theatre & LaVilla Museum, Jacksonville, Florida; and Rex Ziak, Naselle, Washington.

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Committee on Environment and Public Works:* Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety resumed oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, focusing on how the NRC and the industry will move forward with credibility and safety to ensure that nuclear power continues to be an important part of meeting economic, energy, and environment needs in the United States, after receiving testimony from Nils J. Diaz, Chairman, Edward McGaffigan, Jr., Commissioner, and Jeffrey S. Merrifield, Commissioner, all of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Marvin S. Fertel, Nuclear Energy Institute, and David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists, both of Washington, D.C.; Marilyn C. Kray, Exelon Nuclear, Kimberton, Pennsylvania, on behalf of NuStart Energy Development LLC; and Barclay G. Jones,

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Department of Nuclear and Radiological Engineering, Urbana.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Finance:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Juan Carlos Zarate, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, and Stuart Levey, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Enforcement, both of the Department of the Treasury, and John O. Colvin, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

### PRESCRIPTION DRUG REIMPORTATION

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine prescription drug reimportation, focusing on efforts to reduce drug costs, patient safety concerns, recent state action, fraudulent and counterfeit drugs, an international comparison of rising prescription drug expenditures, and S. 2328, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs, after receiving testimony from John M. Taylor, Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs, and William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning, both of the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; John A. Vernon, University of Connecticut Center for Healthcare and Insurance Studies, Storrs; Philip Lee, Stanford University, Stanford, California; and Tim Malone, Livermore, California.

### NATIVE AMERICAN CONNECTIVITY ACT

*Committee on Indian Affairs:* Committee held a hearing to examine S. 2382, to establish grant programs for the development of telecommunications capacities in Indian country, receiving testimony from J.D. Williams, National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.; and Kade L. Twist, Native Networking Policy Center, Reston, Virginia.

Hearing recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

### FBI OVERSIGHT OF TERRORISM

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the FBI, counterterrorism, and intelligence arenas, focusing on steps the FBI has taken to put critical capabilities in place by reforming counterterrorism and intelligence programs, as well as overhauling information technology, after receiving testimony from Robert S. Mueller III, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1933, to promote effective enforcement of copyrights, with amendments;

S. Res. 362, expressing the sense of the Senate on the dedication of the National World War II Memorial on May 29, 2004, in recognition of the duty, sacrifices, and valor of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in World War II;

H. Con. Res. 409, recognizing with humble gratitude the more than 16,000,000 veterans who served in the United States Armed Forces during World War II and the Americans who supported the war effort on the home front and celebrating the completion of the National World War II Memorial on the National Mall in the District of Columbia; and

''The nomination of Jonathan W. Dudas, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* Committee ordered favorably reported Pamela M. Iovino, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Congressional Affairs.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Measures Introduced:** 10 public bills, H.R. 4409–4469; and 11 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 432–438, and H. Res. 651–654 were introduced.

**Pages H3437–40, H3537–40**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H3440–41, H3540–41**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H.R. 4200 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, (H. Rept. 108–491, Pt. 2);

S. 1301, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit video voyeurism in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, amended (H. Rept. 108–504);

H.R. 1678, to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to false communications about certain criminal violations, amended (H. Rept. 108–505);

H.R. 2991, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional recycling project and in the Cucamonga County Water District recycling project (H. Rept. 108–506);

H.R. 3378, to assist in the conservation of marine turtles and the nesting habitats of marine turtles in foreign countries (H. Rept. 108–507);

H.R. 1014, to require Federal land managers to support, and to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with, designated gateway communities, to improve the ability of gateway communities to participate in Federal land management planning conducted by the Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior, and to respond to the impacts of the public use of the Federal lands administered by these agencies, amended (H. Rept. 108–508, Pt. 1);

H.R. 3846, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement or contract with Indian tribes meeting certain criteria to carry out projects to protect Indian forest land, amended (H. Rept. 108–509, Pt. 1);

H.R. 3504, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to redesignate the American Indian Education Foundation as the National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education (H. Rept. 108–510, Pt. 1);

H.R. 3247, to provide consistent enforcement authority to the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service to respond to violations of regulations regarding the management, use, and protection of public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies, to clarify the purposes for which collected fines may be used, amended; referred sequentially to the House Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than June 30, 2004 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(k), rule X. (Rept. 108–511, Pt. 1);

H.R. 3874, to convey for public purposes certain Federal lands in Riverside County, California, that have been identified for disposal, amended (H. Rept. 108–512); and

H.R. 2966, to preserve the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on public lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, administered by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service where there is a historical tradition of such use, amended (H. Rept. 108–513, Pt. 1). **Pages H3436–37, H3536–37**

**Chaplain:** The prayer was offered today by Rev. Michael Bentley, Pastor, First Baptist Church in Brevard, North Carolina. **Page H3393**

**Resignation of House Parliamentarian:** Read a letter from the Honorable Charles W. Johnson wherein he resigned as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives after 40 years of service, effective May 31, 2004. **Page H3394**

**House Parliamentarian Appointed:** The Speaker appointed John V. Sullivan as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives to succeed Charles W. Johnson, resigned. **Page H3394**

**Expressing Gratitude to the Honorable Charles W. Johnson, Parliamentarian:** The House agreed to H. Res. 651, expressing the gratitude of the House of Representatives to its Parliamentarian, the Honorable Charles W. Johnson **Pages H3394–H3404**

**National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005:** The House passed H.R. 4200, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, by a recorded vote of 391 ayes to 34 noes, Roll No. 206. The bill was also considered on Wednesday, May 19. **Pages H3406–31, H3445–57**

Rejected the Waxman motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report it back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 202 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 205. **Pages H3454–56**

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services printed in the bill was considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. **Page H3454**

Pursuant to section 4 of H. Res. 648, it was agreed on Wednesday, May 19, that the Slaughter amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) be considered out of the order printed in H. Rept. 108–499.

Pursuant to H. Res. 648, it was agreed on Wednesday, May 19, that certain amendments be placed in order as though printed in H. Rept. 108–499 and numbered 29, 30, 31, and 32; that

amendment numbered 13 in H. Rept 108–499 be modified in the form that was placed at the desk; and that the amendments and the modification placed at the desk be considered as read. **Page H3406**

Agreed To:

Weldon of Pennsylvania (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) amendment that was debated on Wednesday, May 19, that expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should assist the Iraqi Government in destroying the Abu Ghraib prison and replacing it with a modern detention facility (by a recorded vote of 308 ayes to 114 noes, Roll No. 201); **Pages H3411–12**

Skelton amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) that was debated on Wednesday, May 19, that requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive policy for the Department of Defense on the prevention of and response to sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces and requires the DoD to take related measures to address sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces (by a recorded vote of 410 ayes with none voting ''no,'' Roll No. 202); **Pages H3412–14**

Hunter en bloc amendment consisting of amendments printed in H. Rept. 108–499 and numbered 10, that makes a variety of substantive changes to the bill and makes a technical cite correction; No. 12, that clarifies provisions in the bill relating to tanker procurement; No. 13, that restores funds to the Department of Energy's Defense Site Acceleration Completion account for ''Waste Incidental to Reprocessing''; No. 15, that directs the Secretary of Defense to eliminate the backlog in forensic evidence collection kits and to provide an adequate supply of forensic evidence collection kits at all domestic and overseas U.S. military installations, military academies, and theaters of operation; No. 16, that requires that sureties would be treated in the same manner as financing institutions when contractors default; No. 17, that allows procurement officials within the Department of Defense to include the creation of jobs in the United States as an evaluation factor; No. 18, that authorizes landscaping services and pest control for inclusion in the Comp Demonstration program; No. 19, that permits firefighter's Federal Excess Property Program, administered by the U.S. Forest Service, to screen Department of Defense excess property at the same level of law enforcement, defense contractors, defense-related organizations, and humanitarians services for combating forest fires and other fire suppression purposes; No. 20, that expands the Department of Defense Excess Personal Property Disposal Program to include health agencies; No. 21, that requires the Secretary of Defense, when submitting a budget request for construction of a military medical treatment facility and the Secretary of Veteran's Affairs when proposing construction of a new or replacement medical facility, to certify that the facility was evaluated, with the consultation of the other Secretary, for the feasibility of establishing a joint DoD–VA medical facility; No. 22, that provides authority for removal of remains of certain persons interred in United States Military Cemeteries overseas; No. 23, that requires the Secretary of Defense to study various aspects of mental health services available to U.S. military personal deployed to combat theaters and requires the Secretary to submit a report of the study; No. 24, that specifies the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy and sets certain recommendations and requirements for meetings of the Board; No. 26, that corrects an Army regulation that requires South Korea-based combat troops to be involved in 5 firefights in order to qualify for their combat recognition medals; No. 27, that allows the Secretary of the Army to establish a Combat Service Recognition Ribbon to recognize participation in combat by members of the Army, regardless of branch; No. 28, that allows the Department of Defense, Nisqually Tribe, and Bonneville Power Administration to complete their agreement to move power lines currently crossing the Nisqually Indian Reservation to land on the Fort Lewis Army base; No. 29, that directs placement of a memorial at Arlington National Cemetery honoring noncitizen service members killed in the line of duty while serving in the U.S. Armed Forces; No. 30, that increases funds authorized for construction at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia, offset by a reduction in funds for Air Force Reserve land acquisition and construction; No. 31, that provides additional funds for the procurement of the Aircraft Wireless Intercom System and for bladefold kits for Apache helicopters; and No. 32, that establishes a college financial assistance program for the DC National Guard; **Pages H3418–27**

Wamp amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept 108–499) that makes changes to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; and **Pages H3427–29**

Ryun of Kansas amendment (No. 25 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) that requires the Secretary of Defense to initiate senior officer official educational programs with Taiwan (by a recorded vote of 290 ayes to 132 noes, Roll No. 204).

**Pages H3429–31, H3453–54**

Rejected:

Kennedy of Minnesota amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) that sought to eliminate the 2-year BRAC delay containing in the bill and require that certain reports be submitted to Congress approximately six months before any potential vote

to disapprove the recommendations of the BRAC Commission in order to review and hold hearings on the report (by a recorded vote of 162 ayes to 259 noes, Roll No. 200; and **Pages H3406–11**

Tauscher amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) that sought to transfer funds from the Department of Energy's Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and Advanced Concepts programs to increase both intelligence capabilities to get at hard and deeply buried targets and improved conventional bunker-busting capabilities (by a recorded vote of 204 ayes to 214 noes, Roll No. 203).

**Pages H3415–18, H3453**

The Clerk was authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the bill. **Page H3457**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. **Page H3457**

H. Res. 648, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to on Wednesday, May 19.

**Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2003:** The House disagreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 1047, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and agreed to a conference. **Page H3414**

Appointed as conferees: From the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendments, and modifications committed in conference, Representatives Thomas, Crane, Shaw, Rangel, and Levin. **Page H3414**

**Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004:** The House passed H.R. 4359, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit, by a recorded vote of 271 ayes to 139 noes, Roll No. 209. **Pages H3459–75**

Rejected the Levin amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in H. Rept. 108–496 by a yea and nay vote of 187 yeas to 226 nays, Roll No. 208.

**Pages H3467–74**

H. Res. 644, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a voice vote.

**Pages H3431–34, H3443–45**

**Participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization:** Agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 2092, to address the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H3457–58**

**Memorial Day District Work Period:** The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 432, providing for the conditional adjournment of the House and the conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate, by a yea and nay vote of 222 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 207.

**Pages H3458–59**

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Monday, May 24, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in H. Con. Res. 432, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

**Page H3475**

**Calendar Wednesday:** Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, June 2.

**Page H3475**

**Speaker Pro Tempore:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Gilchrest or, if not available to perform this duty, Representative Thornberry to act as Speaker pro tempore for sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 1, 2004. **Page H3475**

**Presidential Messages:** Read a letter from the President wherein he notified the Congress of the continuation of the national emergency protecting the Development Fund for Iraq—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 108–187); and **Pages H3475–76**

Read a letter from the President wherein he transmitted the 8th biennial revision (2004–2008) to the United States Arctic Research Plan—referred to the Committee on Science. **Page H3476**

Read a letter from the President wherein he transmitted a report entitled "2004 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy for Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act"—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. **Page H3499**

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate today appears on page H3393.

**Senate Referral:** S. 213, S. 524, S. 943, S. 960, S. 1107, S. 1577, and S. 2178 were referred to the Committee on Resources; S. 1576 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and S. 15, S. 1167, S. 1516, and S. 1848 were held at the desk.

**Page H3434**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Two yea and nay votes and eight recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3411, H3412, H3413, H3453, H3453–54, H3456, H3456–57, H3458, H3474, and H3474–75. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10 a.m. and pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 432, the House stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday,

May 24, 2004, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of H. Con. Res. 432, in which case the House shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, June 1.

# *Committee Meetings*

## FARM SECURITY AND RURAL INVESTMENT ACT REVIEW

*Committee on Agriculture:* Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing to review the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002. Testimony was heard from Keith Collins, Chief Economist, USDA; and public witnesses.

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs held a hearing on Department of the Treasury (International Affairs). Testimony was heard from John Taylor, Under Secretary, International Affairs, Department of the Treasury.

## TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on the Secretary of the Treasury. Testimony was heard from John W. Snow, Secretary of the Treasury.

## EPA'S RESOURCE CONSERVATION CHALLENGE

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled ''EPA's Resource Conservation Challenge.'' Testimony was heard from Matthew Hale, Deputy Director, Office of Solid Waste, EPA.

## MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARDS

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Medicare Prescription Drug Discount Cards: Immediate Savings for Seniors.'' Testimony was heard from Mark B. McClellan, M.D., Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Humans Services; and public witnesses.

## OVERSIGHT—HUD'S BUDGET

*Committee on Financial Services:* Held an oversight hearing on the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Department's budget request for fiscal year 2005. Testimony was heard from Alphonso Jackson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

## FEDERAL CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS

*Committee on Government Reform:* Held a hearing entitled ''Redundancy and Duplication in Federal Child Welfare Programs: A Case Study on the Need for Executive Reorganization Authority.'' Testimony was heard from Representative DeLay; Wade Horn, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; J. Robert Flores, Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice; and Colien Hefferan, Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, USDA.

## ''HISTORIC PRESERVATION OF THE PEOPLING OF AMERICA''

*Committee on Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing entitled ''Historic Preservation of the Peopling of America.'' Testimony was heard from Janet Snyder Matthews, Associate Director, Cultural Resources, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

## OVERSIGHT—FEC AND THE 527 RULEMAKING PROCESS

*Committee on House Administration:* Held an oversight hearing on the Federal Election Commission and the 527 Rulemaking Process. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Federal Election Commission: Bradley A. Smith, Chairman; Ellen L. Weintraub, Vice Chair; Scott E. Thomas and Michael Toner, both Commissioners.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE U.S. REAUTHORIZATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held an oversight hearing entitled ''Reauthorization of the Administrative Conference of the United States.'' Testimony was heard from the following Associate Justices of the Supreme Court: Antonin Scalia and Stephen G. Beyer.

## OVERSIGHT

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Courts, Internet, and Intellectual Property held an oversight hearing entitled ''Derivative Rights, Moral Rights, and Movie Filtering Technology.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## OVERSIGHT—DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON OCEAN POLICY

*Committee on Resources:* Held an oversight hearing on the ''Draft Report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean

Policy.'' Testimony was heard from ADM James D. Watkins, USN (Ret.), Chairman, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

## STEEL AND ALUMINUM ENERGY CONSERVATION AND TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS ACT

*Committee on Science:* Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing on An Examination of H.R. 3890, to reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988. Testimony was heard from. Douglas L. Faulkner, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

## REFORMING REGULATION

*Committee on Small Business:* Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight held a hearing on Reforming Regulation to Keep America's Small Businesses Competitive. Testimony was heard from Representative Hayworth; and public witnesses.

## OVERTIME REGULATIONS' EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

*Committee on Small Business:* Subcommittee on Workforce, Empowerment, and Government Programs held a hearing on the Department of Labor's Overtime Regulations' Effect on Small Business. Testimony was heard from Alfred B. Robinson, Deputy Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

## OVERSIGHT—GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY AND RESTORATION EFFORTS

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held an oversight hearing on Great Lakes Water Quality and Restoration Efforts. Testimony was heard from Thomas V. Skinner, Manager, Great Lakes National Program Office, EPA; Gerald W. Barnes, Director of Programs, Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Stephen B. Brandt, Director, Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, NOAA, Department of Commerce; R. Mack Gray, Deputy Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, USDA; and Robyn Thorson, Regional Director, Midwest Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

## SSI PROGRAM

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on the SSI program. Testimony was heard from Robert E. Robertson, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, GAO; Patrick O'Carroll, Acting Inspector General, SSA; David Podoff, member, Social Security Advisory Board; and public witnesses.

## BRIEFING—DETAINEE ISSUES RELATED TO GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Met in executive session to receive a briefing on detainee issues related to the Global War on terrorism. The Committee was briefed by MG Jeffery Miller, USA, Deputy Commander for Detainee Operations, Commander Joint Task Force 7, Department of Defense.

---

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 21, 2004

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

### Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

### House

*Committee on Armed Services,* hearing on the conduct and support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

*Committee on Government Reform,* hearing entitled ''Thirsty for Results: Lessons Learned From the District of Columbia's Lead Contamination Experience,'' 10 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,* Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, to continue oversight hearings on Great Lakes Water Quality and Restoration Efforts, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Next Meeting of the* SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, May 21

Senate Chamber

**Program for Friday:** Senate will continue consideration of S. 2400, Department of Defense Reauthorization Act.

*Next Meeting of the* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Tuesday, June 1

House Chamber

**Program for Tuesday:** To be announced.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.