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.
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 become parents and 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 would allow more middle-class 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 rate of 4.2 percent during the first two quarters 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 right and 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 colleagues 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. I will 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 the 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, we increased the historic 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 the provisions we ever passed ever in this House or ever in this country. So if that is the case, if we reversed that and none of their policies went forward since we 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 questions. First of all, if we give tax cuts to 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 their gas tax, their gas 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. The Democrats have 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.

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 of the 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 $10,000 receive the full credit; those who would make more 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 $399,000.

This is unnecessary, misguided and irresponsible. Families that at income levels already enjoy 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 taxes would put more money in the pockets of all Americans, 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 poor or the elderly. Currently, 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 wind 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 is unacceptably small. It is an unspirited omission of these families from the accelerated increase in the child tax credit enjoyed by higher-income taxpayers. The cost of this is an average improvement of only 1.5 percent.

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 ($10.30) 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 ($220 per child) this is the most egregious part of a House tax cut.

We are now experiencing record deficits. We are going into debt. We are passing on to the 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 hard working 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. KROLLENBERG). 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.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 can do for them, their families and in acknowledgment 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 lost 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 whether they were 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. If I do not believe in 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 an unjust war.

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 $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 $25 billion 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, while 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 help them keep safe. But, as their deployments are extended and hostilities increase, we need to have a strategy 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 have 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.

Mr. NAVIGENT. 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. This section was inserted in the bill 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 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 an amendment 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 Department of Transportation agreed that the property could be transferred to GSA on a non-reversionary basis 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 GSA by a process of a negotiated 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 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 the sea-based ballistic 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 Guard and Reserves and National Guard, and the need for greater international military support. Shutting out a full debate on these issues is a great failure of this bill and of my District.

Just like 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 request, the administration had been authorizing 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 engagement in Iraq.

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 in 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 disposal 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 administrationsecretly moved approximately $200 billion 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 unaccept-able; 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, and 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 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 over-stretched, and we can’t and shouldn’t continue to rely on 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 caused medical costs to increase. I am encouraged—unfortunately, I can’t report 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.

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

I strongly opposed 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 in 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 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, beryl- 

ium and silica. It has worked fairly well—something that can’t be said about the second part.

On the compensation program established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation 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 programs to assure payments for work 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, New York, 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 does not 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. The White House has 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 is not just the White House. I and others described in a report released several years there were serious problems with the administration 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 against 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 to 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 do not have a plan. 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 are awarded on the basis of the best offer. 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 are awarded on the basis of best offer. And when the Administration explains that the prime contractor will perform all work, it is not surprising that the White House has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects.

The public wonders why unsupervised private contractors would be allowed to try to sell us false claims.

For those who worked at Rocky Flats and other DOE nuclear sites, the question 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 against 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 to 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 do not have a plan. 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 are awarded on the basis of the best offer. And when the Administration explains that the prime contractor will perform all work, it is not surprising that the White House has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects.

Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects. Unfortunately, the Administration has not been able to identify the costs of these projects.
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 condemned, 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 defense that is plagued by 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 cost to research the feasibility of an earth-penetrating 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 non-proliferation 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 signal to the world. Moreover, this bill authorizes an additional $28 million for research on nuclear bunker busting capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose those provisions in the FY 2005 Defense Authorization Bill which authorize $28 million for nuclear bunker busting research. The Bush Administration is leading our nation on a quest for usable nuclear weapons policy by steadily increasing spending for this type of destabilizing research. We are opening Pandora’s box and encouraging the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons. 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 we will no longer have to spend $60 billion to $200 billion per year on nuclear weapons.

The Bush Administration’s pursuit of new tactical nuclear weapons for use in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere is a dangerous waste of taxpayer dollars. The Pentagon’s own Independent Nuclear Posture Review was a complete failure and called for a one-third reduction in the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The Bush Administration is now reversing that decision and seeking to increase our nuclear weapons stockpile.

Second, it is relatively easy to build a bunker buster. Bush administration officials have said that this weapon could be “deployed around the world in 12 to 18 months.” This statement is not only completely inaccurate; it is dangerous.

First, since weapons cannot penetrate very hard rock, it is counterintuitive to build a bunker buster that could destroy a nuclear bunker. The bunker buster is a “penetrator” that will not penetrate concrete and will destroy deep targets. The U.S. National Intelligence Council has stated that the Bush Administration is moving toward increasing nuclear weapons. This is a dangerous and irresponsible step.

The Bush Administration is leading our nation on a quest for usable nuclear weapons policy by steadily increasing spending for this type of destabilizing research. We are opening Pandora’s box and encouraging the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose those provisions in the FY 2005 Defense Authorization Bill which authorize $28 million for nuclear bunker busting research. The Bush Administration is leading our nation on a quest for usable nuclear weapons policy by steadily increasing spending for this type of destabilizing research. We are opening Pandora’s box and encouraging the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons.

First, since weapons cannot penetrate very hard rock, it is counterintuitive to build a bunker buster that could destroy a nuclear bunker. The bunker buster is a “penetrator” that will not penetrate concrete and will destroy deep targets. The U.S. National Intelligence Council has stated that the Bush Administration is moving toward increasing nuclear weapons. This is a dangerous and irresponsible step.

Second, 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 and delay the next round of base closings.

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 and delay the next round of base closings.

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 busting.
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 Homeland Security 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 before we have the chance to 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 increasing end-strength in any BRAC plan.

I also continue to be extremely concerned that if the BRAC round in 2005 commences, we will revert back to pre-Water World 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 be put off 2 years (1 year if you start at the first 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).

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 is required by 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 conference 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 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.

Hon. WILLIAM THOMAS, 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 is required by 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 conference 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 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.

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 is required by 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 conference 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 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.

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

May 20, 2004

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, upon your request, your letter and this response will be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Without reservation.

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 De-

Committee on International Rel- 

lations, House of Representa-

tives,


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 Rela-

tions concerning H.R. 4200, the FY 2005 National Defense Authorization Act. I commend your leadership, and that of Mr. SKELLY, in working 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 ter-

torror successfully.

Further, several of the provisions of Title XIV (in particular, in Subtitle A concerning export controls) amend the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) as it is commonly referred to (as it is commonly referred to) is any defense article that has been approved under section 38 that apply to commercial con-

tractual relationships to receive and transport United States defense articles. Section 1401 accommodates this practice. Similarly, but less frequently, a foreign gov-

dern't may establish an agency relation-

ship with one of its corporations for the pur-

pose of carrying out part of a cooperative agreement it has entered into with the De-

partment of Defense under section 27 of the AECA. Such relationships would still be ac-

knowledged under section 1401, provided that 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.

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 export control law will be carried out in accordance with longstanding prin-

ciples that have safeguarded our Nation's se-

cURITY and foreign policy interests for many years. As noted in the report, section 47 of the AECA now includes (as it has been es-

established. On the other hand, this definition is intended to resolve, definitively in favor of long-standing principles in United States law, the controversy in which some maintain the term "agent" can be construed as any foreign person who has a general association with a for-

eign government (United States agents of foreign defense articles or defense services, such that any (and potentially all) foreign corpora-
tions 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 approval for transfer from the foreign government to its private sector. However, such a construction would run counter to well-established principles in both the AECA and section 505(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act which are very important. Section 3(a) provides that "no defense article or defense service shall be transferred 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 any-

one not an officer, employee, or agent of that agency ... unless the consent of the Presi-
dent has first been obtained." Section 505(a) provides a nearly identical requirement with respect to military assist-

ance provided under Chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act. These provisions (which also provide a legal framework for commercial arms sales) specify that the AECA ensure that all of the stringencies and safeguards that apply under United States law to a weapons related export also apply to United States export and reexport of another defense article or related training or other defense service ... to any-

one not an officer, employee, or agent of the U.S. Government or foreign government. This requirement is to be understood in its classic and commonly understood form, that a person that is specifically authorized by the foreign government to represent its inter-

ests (other than an officer or employee, who are presumptively authorized representa-
tives, for example, to foreign government's supervision and control and for whom the foreign government is responsible (such as an officer or employee). The 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 gov-

dern't may establish an agency relation-

ship with one of its corporations for the pur-

pose of carrying out part of a cooperative agreement it has entered into with the De-

partment of Defense under section 27 of the AECA. Such relationships would still be ac-

knowledged under section 1401, provided that the foreign government has been es-

established. On the other hand, this definition is intended to resolve, definitively in favor of long-standing principles in United States law, the controversy in which some maintain the term "agent" can be construed as any foreign person who has a general association with a for-

eign government (United States agents of foreign defense articles or defense services, such that any (and potentially all) foreign corpora-
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 when the same 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 permitted the Department of State to define those articles for the foreign end user to sign a U.S. Government nontransferable and end-use certificate before a license is issued. A further challenge is the fact that the State Department has not yet been able to put into place an adequate system for monitoring and tracking the export of SME that are subject to license requirements (let alone exemptions). In this respect, more than four years after the enactment of Public Law 106–113 requiring a quarterly report on all license exceptions, the closest coalition partners are placed at the head of the line. In this way, export involving coalition partners can be processed more securely (without the increased risks of diversion) and not allowed to slip. I believe 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) and not allowed to slip. While we should not be unduly concerned in regard 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 HUNT and Ranking Member SHELTON 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 and the men and women who serve in it—"" the resources they need to keep America strong. 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 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 equal job opportunities 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 2/3, and in some cases, dropping as much as 70% of their income at the age of 62. Congress has repeatedly provided 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 their 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. It lost 10,000 jobs and its government 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 legislation.

Mr. BACA. 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, most specifically the Defense Authorization bill funds procurement initiatives near-and-dear to my heart, to include full funding for the Up Armored 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 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 that 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 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 were postponed and a recorded vote has been demanded.

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 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 Clerk redesignated 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES—204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NOT VOTING—16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 MISSOURI**

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.

**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 290, noes 132, not voting 1, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES—290</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is agreed to. The bill is engrossed and read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND 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 reads as follows:

Mr. Waxman moves to recommit 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. 1534. SENSE OF HOUSE CONCERNING ESTABLISHMENT OR SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE TO INVESTIGATE THE TREATMENT OF DETAINES 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 accountable for the administration (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;

(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 claims about Niger’s alleged weapons of mass destruction.

He correctly concluded failures are multiplying because of choices for which no one claims accountability. 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 hold them accountable for their conduct.

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; after all, they played, to whom they were 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. How 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 and could lead to increased soundbites for our enemies.” Our enemies are already gleeeful 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 amounted 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 outgoing CIA agency’s 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 not. The White House has 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 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 on the House that have different jurisdictions on this matter. Let us bring them all together in one select committee. 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 Intelligence, 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 t\eed point that it is our duty to investigate. 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 Anthony Taguba just before 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 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 security police and a police force.

They are fighting to secure hospitals and schools. They are fighting to protect civilians, the citizens, the 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 was told in the press yesterday that the investigation that is ongoing by the 911 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, the effect: There is only one enemy in the world as champions of democracy and human rights.

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 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 down, and it resulted in the prating of another fine 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 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 deletions 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 tremendous losses. We have had tremendous 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 members 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 who wear the uniform of the United States. We do that by giving them the tools to get the job done, and this bill, including the invasion of Normandy. It is the best and most wonderful 2.5 million people that we have had outright.

We have to return our focus to this war. 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 tremendous losses. We have had tremendous 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 members 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 who wear the uniform of the United States. We do that by giving them the tools to get the job done, and this bill, including the invasion of Normandy. It is the best and most wonderful 2.5 million people that we have had outright.

We have to return our focus to this war. 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.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHEY). Mr. Speaker, I ask for its immediate consideration in the House of a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations. The motion to recommit is before the Chair. I ask for its immediate consideration in the House of a motion to reconsider the bill as ordered. The motion to reconsider is before the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHEY). Mr. Speaker, the Chair will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, do I have the unanimous consent of the House to make corrections in H.R. 4200, the bill entitled ‘‘Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 and Making Appropriate Authorizations for Military Construction for Fiscal Year 2005’’? I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHEY, pro tem). The Chair will state his parliamentary inquiry.
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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, registered 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 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 1990’s.

(9) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention 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 20,500,000 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, and that such membership is not impossible, 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 complex issue, but we do not shrink from taking a public stance on it. The people of Taiwan deserve the same level of public health care 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 (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 infectious and contagious disease accelerates, it is crucial that all people, including the people of Taiwan, be given the opportunity to participate in international health organizations of 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 the elements of the plan;

(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 Assembly Organization (WHAO) 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 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 the 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 reads 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, or Saturday, May 22, 2004, or at any time after that pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, May 20, 2004, and Friday, May 21, 2004, on Saturday, May 22, 2004, or on any day thereafter until noon on Tuesday, June 1, 2004, or at any other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, June 1, 2004, or for any 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 certify that the floor 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 had it.

Mr. HINCHLEY. 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

Akkin

Bachus

Ballenger

Barrett (SC)

Barrett (MD)

Barton (TX)

Bass

Beauprez

Bereuter

Burgert

Bucshinsky

Bishop (UT)

Blackburn

Brown

Boehlert

Boehner

Bono

Booher

Bradley (NY)

Brown (SC)

Brown-Weiche

Burgess

Burns

Burr (NV)

Calvert

Cannon

Cantor

Cardin (MD)

Carter

Castle

Chabot

Chocola

Clyburn

Cole

Collins

Conyers

Crafter

Crenshaw

Culhane

Cubin

Culver

Cunningham

Davis, Jo Ann

Davis, Tom

DeLauro

Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks

Doolittle

Ehlers

Duncan

Dunn

Ehlers

Emerson

Everett

Feingold

Ferguson

Flake

Forbes

Fossella

Fossella (AZ)

Frolichsen

Gailey

Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach

Gibbons

GhilchDET

Gilmore

Johnson (CT)

Johnson (IL)

Jones (NC)

Kildee

Kirk

Kotek

Krause

Kucinich

LaHood

Latham

LaTourette

Laxalt

LePage

LoBiondo

Linder

Luttrell

Lummus

Lucas (OK)

Manzullo

McClure

McClellan

McCaul

McCaul

McGeachin

McKeon

McKernan

McNulty

McNulty

McGovern

Menendez

Moats

Mica

Miller (FL)

Miller (MD)

Miller, Gary

Morgan (KS)

Murphy

Murtha

McKeon

Mica

Miller (FL)

Miller (OR)

McAuliffe

Moran (MD)

Nussle

Osborne

Otter

Paul

Pence

Pettengill (IA)

Petri

Petri

Petri

Peters

Picciotto

Pomeroy

Portman

Pray (OH)

Putnam

Quinn

Rada

Ramstad

Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)

Robach

Ros-Lehtinen

Royce

Ruppersgerber

Ryan (WI)

Ryun (KS)

Sabo

Saxton

Schrack

Sensenbrenner

Sessions

Shadegg

Shadegg

Shays

Sherwood

Shuster

Shuster

Shuster

Simmons

Simmons

Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)

Souders

Sullivan

Sweeney

Taylor (NC)

Taylor (SC)

Thornberry

Thurber

Tiberi

Toomey

Tutu (OH)

Upton

Vitter

Walker (OR)

Wamp

Weldon (FL)

Weiler

Weichert

Wicker

Wilson (NM)

Willis (SC)

Wing

Wynn

Yoss (NY)

Young (AK)

Young (FL)
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.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 644, I call up the bill (H.R. 3459) 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. 3459 is as follows:

H.R. 3459

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 any child (as defined in section 24(b)(3)) the following:

(1) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—Clause (i) of section 24(b)(3) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Threshold Amount.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘threshold amount’ means $1,225,000 ($250,000 in the case of a joint return)."

(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 (1) of section 24(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “10 percent”.

(d) COMBAT PAY TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—Paragraph (2) of section 24(b) 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 because the bill allows combat pay to be treated as earned income for the taxable year will be reduced in the same manner as combat pay from being included 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. 3459, the Child Credit Preservation and Expansion Act of 2004, would provide permanent tax relief to 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 credit 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 enhance 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. 3459 also provides for the permanent tax benefits that Members that 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. As a result, military 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 tax 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; it is an 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.

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 a tax break for families in the 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. It 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 only really for families earning $10,000, 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.

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 had 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, 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 it happen. 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 financing to pay the cost of this tax cut, and it 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 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 the 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
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 is now very well and thriving, we talked about the tax credit. This was at breakfast just across the street. He was amazed and appalled and shocked that we would see 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 do not have this 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 credit that is 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. Home ownership 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.

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 across from 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 engaging 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 entrepreneur spirit around 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 family and 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 “what’s the option.” We created the debt tax that will burden all of our children least by greatly increasing the huge tax breaks for those who need them least. We are doing today, yet again, is offering them less by greatly increasing the debt tax that will burden all of our children and grandchildren for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, 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. CAMMACK. 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 is now very well and thriving, we talked about the tax credit. This was at breakfast just across the street. He was amazed and appalled and shocked that we would see 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 do not have this 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 credit that is 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. Home ownership 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.

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 across from 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 engaging 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 entrepreneur spirit around 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
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 at the purpose of giving tax refunds 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), that it is paid for and we should stop this economic malpractice against the people of this country.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, 1 yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Brown).

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked 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 time this 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 hardworking families. By raising 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 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 pornographic entertainment industry and the media, our tax system should not feed these special appeals to those that have so much.

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 the policy 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 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, and if we made them a net, not a tax bill.

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 in our Nation has 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 was not done 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, that 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 I have always believed we have to give you to be patriotic enough to want 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 percent 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 got you $1,000, you have a job, 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 when you had to go out and get you to be patriotic enough to know that you can make a sacrifice? But how did it turn out? I am giving you $1,000 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 world, you would not do 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 the future.

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 on the side of those people in the Congress that was a part of this?

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 what we give tax cuts and social services and education and homeland 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.’

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 are blessed and provided 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 increasing the 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, 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 legislation on the floor and then tried to portray and dismayed 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 means back 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 efforts, this person opposed, this 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 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 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 gentlemanwoman 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 casting 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 the next generation of 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 4 1/2 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. 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 health care. That is not a figure that puts the kids anything but 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 very hard 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? 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 the twentieth century that we were putting money in the bank. We were disciplined and we did it. It is 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 priorities. 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. We will have to take some discipline to pass 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 go into 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 2 1/2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 14 1/2 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. LEWIS).

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

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.

There are some 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.
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. CAMP. 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 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 Federal, state, and local 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, the money is coming back. It actually means more money to spend. We are trying 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 4% 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. CAMP) has 6 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. 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 transactions, is $1.7 trillion more than it was 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 unwarrented 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 $10,000 threshold. Those who are 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.
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 up 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 anyone earning 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 to 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 whose incomes range from $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 a transfer to 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 the wealth of the rich. The Republican proposal, 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 tax cuts 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 incomes the richest of American 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 wealthiest of Americans, H.R. 4359 is grotesquely immoral and is a worst-of-the-world policy.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support the substitute and defeat the $228 billion dollars of debt in the underlying 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 incomes the richest of American 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 wealthiest of Americans, 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 tax cuts 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 incomes the richest of American 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 wealthiest of Americans, H.R. 4359 is simply another demonstration of the majority’s contempt for working American families.

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 inclusion required tough 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 tax credits to be doubled on 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 increases the debt of the future at the expense of working families.
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 that puts at risk 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 more to give anyone any additional service or benefit, just paying interest.

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 no one has 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.

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 child tax credit...
Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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 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 $200,000 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 $200,000.

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 care for their own hard-earned 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. LEVIT, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Do not keep repeating a big fib. This AMT was not supposed to cover except a small minority of the taxpayers. We did not claim that amount would be in the 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 that self such time as I may consume.

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

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 tax 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 be lost. We would not be able to pay for the AMT.

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 in 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 majorities 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. DELAUNOY), one of the cosponsors of the substitute.

Ms. DELAUNOY. 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 the 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 million dollar family 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 this 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.

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 $200,000 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 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 hardworking 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, each child has 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 withholding the child tax credit for your children and their children. They are providing tax relief for the very wealthy, 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, Teddy, 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 interest to work in a Nation crippled by debt. My grandchildren and yours deserve better than that.

The Democratic substitute we are considering 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 parents, who are expecting to be born before the end of the year.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

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.

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.

I mention that because every dollar of tax relief that this bill provides 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 and others who appreciate much of the work we have done together on the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

I would say, just a couple of weeks ago, there is another new, 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 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 cut, 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 to yourself, well, Mom and Dad, you have to take 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 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 want for more and to get 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 2 minutes.

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. 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. And I think--those kids get taken care of 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 poorest 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 amendment that 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 needed most, not the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), not my friends.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes.

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 and 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. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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 $580 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 $226 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 they will do in order, not raise 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. 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. Emanual).

Mr. Emanual. Mr. Speaker, twenty-two million new jobs, the beginning of an economic recovery. Lifting 7 million families out of poverty, the beginning of an economic recession. Reduction of uninsured in this country from 44 million to 36 million, the beginning of our economic recession?

There is a rampant case of an inversion in the world. In 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 middle-class future. We would have sworn in the 1980s when I was around, all the Republican leaders said 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 reminder of what happens when there is a recession 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 history, and a rendezvous with 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 generation. It was not respectful to the middle class families that actually bring some fiscal sanity to the process.

I would just say that what we are debating 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 gentlemen 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 in all but name. 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 at a letter by Margaret written to the Houston Chronicle in July 2003 she begged as a student making $10,000, “I would have sworn in the 1980s that I 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 reminder of what happens when there is a recession 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 history, and a rendezvous with balanced budget would look like, since his colleagues have done a great job of adding $3 trillion to the Nation’s debt.

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 a splurge that we cannot afford even in front of a child tax credit for 2 million taxpayers with children 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 his or hers, 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 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 disapproving 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 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) Republicans have already taken us from a $5.6 trillion 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 tax relief 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 this bill. 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 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 to 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 permanent child tax credit to 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 recouping 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 child tax credit permanent, accelerated 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 relief is 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.

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 $35,625 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 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 tried to get a job that would allow for this and I still work. I feel like being able to provide for those that are less fortunate is one of the most important jobs that one can do. It’s where there is no one to lend a helping hand for other families and children.

I would 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.

I urge Members to reject the substitute because it doesn’t make the tax cuts 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 within the spindle of his time, 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 bill is or who the people or ordinary working folks you exclude, you will do exactly what he wants.

I think 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 no certainty 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 but 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 foreign education can be assisted by this $1,000.

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 want to give them 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 pay income taxes. Anybody knows, and graphs show today, that 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, being their economic advisor, the $1,000 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 children who come to family financial 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, then you 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, the jerk away and never say that 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 context and 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 that that is not the circumstances that we were in. We will get out of the deficit again how? By not hoping that keeping taxpayers poor and government revenue 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 question is 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 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 tax credit. We did. 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 main 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,
The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members. 

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. The question was taken; and the result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read 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. 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]
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. GILCREST OR HON. MAC THORNBERY 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:


I hereby appoint the Honorable Wayne T. Gilchrist 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.

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:


GEORGE W. BUSH.

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 the post-season secutive 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 Canton Hoover. 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 through 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 Afghan-istan 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 an outrage to all.

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 high hopes and was 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 and to 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 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.


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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 42 – The Public Health and Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6A—Public Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part D—Primary Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart I—Health Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 254d                          National Health Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter IV—Grants to States for Aid and Services to Needy Families with Children and for Child-Welfare Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B—Child and Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart 2—Promoting Safe and Stable Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 629a                             Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter XI—General Provisions, Peer Review, and Administrative Simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part A—General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1320a-7                          Exclusion of certain individuals and entities from participation in Medicare and state health care programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1320b-17                         Recovery of SSI overpayments from other benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C—Medicare + Choice Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1395w-22                         Benefits and beneficiary protections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1395w-23                         Payments to Medicare + Choice organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1395w-27                         Contracts with Medicare + Choice organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part D—Miscellaneous Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1395x                            Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1395ff                           Determinations; appeals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 35—Programs for Older Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter III—Grants for States and Community Programs on Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C—Nutrition Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart III—General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3030g-21                          General provisions—nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3030s                             Definitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 46—Justice System Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter XII—F—Public Safety Officers’ Death Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part A—Death Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3796d                             Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3796d-1                           Basic eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter XII—H—Grants to Combat Violent Crimes against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3796gg-1                         State grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 84—Department of Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part A—Establishment of Compensation Program and Compensation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter XVI—Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7384s                             Compensation and benefits to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7384u                             Separate treatment of certain uranium employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C—Treatment, Coordination, and Forfeiture of Compensation and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7385c                             Exclusivity of remedy against the United States and against contractors and subcontractors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 110—Family Violence Prevention and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 10410                                           Grants for state domestic violence coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 10421                                           Definitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CATEGORY 2 — VETERANS' BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 38 — Veterans' Benefits</th>
<th>Part II — General Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 17 — Hospital, Nursing Home, Domiciliary, and Medical Care</td>
<td>Subchapter II — Hospital, Nursing Home, Or Domiciliary Care and Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1710B</td>
<td>Extended care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subchapter VIII</strong> — Health Care of Persons other than Veterans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1781</td>
<td>Medical care for survivors and dependents of certain veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1821</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 19 — Insurance</td>
<td>Subchapter III — Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1967</td>
<td>Person insured; amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1969</td>
<td>Deductions; payment; investment; expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 23 — Burial Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2306</td>
<td>Headstones, markers, and burial receptacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III — Readjustment and Related Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 30 — All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program</td>
<td>Subchapter II — Basic Educational Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3020</td>
<td>Transfer of entitlement to basic educational assistance: members of the Armed Forces with critical military skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 42 — Employment and Reemployment Rights of Members of the Uniformed Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4215</td>
<td>Priority of service for veterans in Department of Labor job training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV — General Administrative Provisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 53 — Special Provisions Relating to Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 5302</td>
<td>Waiver of recovery of claims by the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 5313B</td>
<td>Prohibition on providing certain benefits with respect to persons who are fugitive felons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part V — Boards, Administrations, and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 77 — Veterans Benefits Administration</td>
<td>Subchapter II — Veterans Outreach Services Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7721</td>
<td>Purpose; definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 26—Internal Revenue Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle A—Income Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1—Normal Taxes and Surtaxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter A—Determination of Tax Liability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV—Credits Against Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart A—Nonrefundable Personal Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 24</td>
<td>Child tax credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§25A</td>
<td>Hope and lifetime learning credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 25B</td>
<td>Tax imposed on individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter B—Computation of Taxable Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III—Items Specifically Excluded from Gross Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 101</td>
<td>Certain death benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part VII—Additional Itemized Deductions for Individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 138</td>
<td>Medicare + Choice MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 221</td>
<td>Interest on education loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter D—Deferred Compensation, Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I—Pension, Profit-Sharing, Stock Bonus Plans, Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart A—General Rule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 408A</td>
<td>Roth IRAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter F—Exempt Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part VIII—Higher Education Savings Entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 529</td>
<td>Qualified tuition programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 530</td>
<td>Coverdell education savings accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter K—Partners and Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV—Special Rules for Electing Large Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 774</td>
<td>Other modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 775</td>
<td>Electing large partnership defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter O—Gain or Loss on Disposition of Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II—Basis Rules of General Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1022</td>
<td>Treatment of property acquired by decedent dying after December 31, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter W—District of Columbia Enterprise Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1400C</td>
<td>First-time home-buyer credit for District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle B—Estate and Gift Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11—Estate Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter A—Estates Of Citizens Or Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV—Taxable Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2057</td>
<td>Family-owned business interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter C—Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2210</td>
<td>Termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12—Gift Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter B—Transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2511</td>
<td>Transfers in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 13—Tax on Generation-Skipping Transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter D—GST Exemption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2632</td>
<td>Special rules for allocation of GST exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtitle F—Procedure and Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 61—Information and Returns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter A—Returns and Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II—Tax Returns or Statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart B—Income Tax Returns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 6015</td>
<td>Relief from joint and several liability on joint return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III—Information Returns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart B—Information Concerning Transactions with Other Persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 6045</td>
<td>Returns of brokers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1798</th>
<th>Child care services and youth program services for dependents: financial assistance for providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title 37—Pay and Allowances of The Uniformed Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7—Allowances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 403</td>
<td>Basic allowance for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 407</td>
<td>Travel and transportation allowances: dislocation allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 411f</td>
<td>Travel and transportation allowances: transportation for survivors of deceased member to attend the member’s burial ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 427</td>
<td>Family separation allowance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 5—EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND RELATED STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 29—Labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 30—Workforce Investment Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter I—Workforce Investment Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter IV—National Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 30—Mineral Lands and Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 25—Surface Mining Control and Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter VII—Administrative and Miscellaneous Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 46—Justice System Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter XII—Public Safety Officers' Death Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B—Educational Assistance to Dependents of Civilian Federal Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Disabled in the Line of Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3796d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3796d-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 84—Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter XVI—Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7384s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7384u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7385c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 6—IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND ALIENS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 8—Aliens and Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12—Immigration and Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter II—Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II—Admission Qualifications for Aliens; Travel Control of Citizens And Aliens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1183a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV—Inspection, Apprehension, Examination, Exclusion, and Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1229a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1229b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1229c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IX—Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 7—Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 50—Agricultural Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter VI—Delta Regional Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2009aa-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter VII—Northern Great Plains Regional Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2009bb-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter IX—Rural Strategic Investment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2009dd-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATEGORY 10—CRIMES AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 18—Crimes and Criminal Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I—Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 46—Forfeiture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 110A—Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2261A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Title 20 | |
| Chapter 28—Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance |
| Subchapter VIII—Miscellaneous |
| § 1152 | Grants to combat violent crimes against women on campuses |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 28—Judiciary and Judicial Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part V—Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 115—Evidence; Documentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1738C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title 42—The Public Health And Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 135—Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchapter III—Violence against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart 3—Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C—Civil Rights for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 13981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part D—Equal Justice for Women in the Courts Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpart 1—Education and Training for Judges and Court Personnel in State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 13992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 3—Taxation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 4—Federal Civilian and Military Service Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Category 5—Employment Benefits and Related Statutory Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 6—Immigration, Naturalization, and Aliens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 9—Financial Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 10—Crimes and Family Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 11—Loans, Guarantees, and Payments in Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Category 13—Miscellaneous Statutory Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Hall of Fame</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 4307 and § 4309</td>
<td>Amended by Pub. L. No. 105-225, § 1, Aug. 12, 1998, 112 Stat. 1312. These provisions’ references to “survivors” were deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Category 1—Social Security and Related Programs, Housing, and Food Stamps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alien’s eligibility for benefits</td>
<td>42 U.S.C. § 615</td>
<td>Relocated to 42 U.S.C. § 608(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 2—Veterans’ Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Category 4—Federal Civilian and Military Service Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Representatives Child Care Center</td>
<td>40 U.S.C. § 184g</td>
<td>Relocated to 2 U.S.C. § 2062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 5—Employment Benefits and Related Statutory Provisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Category 6—Immigration, Naturalization, and Aliens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Category 7—Indians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Category 9—Financial Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 10—Crimes and Family Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 13—Miscellaneous Statutory Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1997 Statutory Citation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps League</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 57a</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 2301 § 140102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 113</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 2301 § 230102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legion of Valor of the United States of America</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 633</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 1303 § 130302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans of World War I of the United States of America</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 763</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 2303 § 230302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 793 and § 799</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 405 § 40502 and § 40506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinded Veterans Association</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 859</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 303 § 30307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 1005</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 1537 § 153703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Star Wives of America</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 1601</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 805 § 80502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Ex-Prisoners of War</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 2103</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 209 § 20903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc.</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 2603</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 401 § 40103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army and Navy Union of the United States</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 3903</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 229 § 22903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 4003</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 1547 § 4003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Enlisted Association, Incorporated</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 5103</td>
<td>Relocated to chapter 1903 § 190303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Fallen Firefighters Foundation</td>
<td>36 U.S.C. § 5201</td>
<td>Relocated to Chapter 1513 § 151302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for older Americans—state plans</td>
<td>42 U.S.C. § 3035</td>
<td>Relocated to 42 U.S.C. § 3027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4—CATALOGUES 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.

VETERANS—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, and 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 “marital status” 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. 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 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 immigrants and non-immigrant 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 in Title 25. Indians have status figures in the federal law, terms such as “Indian” or “Indians.” From that status derives the special rights and privileges by virtue of the marital relationship.

HUSBANDS OR WIVES OF VETERANS HAVE MANY

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES BY VIRTUE OF THE

MARITAL RELATIONSHIP.

Husbands or wives of veterans have many rights and privileges by virtue of the marital relationship. These rights and privileges include education assistance, and housing. 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, and 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 8—TRADE, COMMERCE, AND INTELLIGENT 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 (or consumer credit); 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. These laws are found in 18 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 marital status in criminal justice or family violence. The nature of these provisions varies greatly. Some deal with spousal crimes of personal violence, such as assault and battery. Others deal with the use of the state or federal criminal justice system to protect a person’s spouse from spousal abuse. This category also includes provisions dealing with crime prevention and family violence. The nature of these provisions varies greatly. Some deal with spousal crimes of personal violence, such as assault and battery. Others deal with the use of the state or federal criminal justice system to protect a person’s spouse from spousal abuse.

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 properties. 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.

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 costs 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 $482 million over the 2004-2008 period and by about $3.2 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.)

The estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 2426 is shown in the following table. The cost of this legislation fall within budget functions 500 (health) and 600 (income security).
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 when the bill is enacted. 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 85 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. Estimates are based on information from state and local governments as well as corporations that have adopted similar policies. In addition, data from non-postal federal 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 1,000,000 employees 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. Unlike premiums for current workers, the government’s share of the federal government pays one-third of basic life insurance premiums and employees pay two-thirds. Optional coverage that provides additional benefits above the basic level is paid for entirely by the employee. H.R. 2426 would allow federal employee who is eligible to receive survivor benefits to face to the account. While the cash flow to the account equal the payments made by the Department of Labor to the FECA retirement fund. The reimbursement of FECA expenses is paid by the Department of Labor 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 (GFLI) Benefits. Under current law, the federal government pays one-third of basic life insurance premiums and employees pay two-thirds. Optional coverage that provides additional 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 to $25,000. The current law for this option is actuarially sound; over time, premiums paid in to the account equal the payments made by the account. 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. The 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.

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-useable material 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 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 de-activate and destroy these weapons and materials has never been greater.

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 21 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 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 $2 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 disarm, secure 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 one. 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, sickers, 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 that magnitude launched at Crete. In fact, it is considered as one of the greatest lessons 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 Stuendt, 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 exhalation and hope to the enslaved peoples of Europe. Major-General Kretschmer, 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 Andartes fighting off the German troops who would 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, 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 and 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 cacophony that was life 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 advanced, surging 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 troops then look 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.

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 descended on the island to fight those soldiers already on the ground. As they fought with 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. Those 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 the Allies had vastly outnumbered the invaders, they 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 showed the German parachute 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 captured and brought 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 Andante 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, 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, 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 that 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 so, 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. It is time for a government 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. 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.

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 with the best American values.

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 governing Congress Party has pledged to continue the economic liberalization efforts of its 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 progress in reducing poverty, but the fact is that India’s economy is still not open enough. Significant obstacles to U.S. participation in India’s economy persist: non-tariff 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 encourages entrepreneurship, and boosted the self-confidence of its citizens, it is sure to benefit India’s 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: non-tariff trade barriers, high tariffs, and weak protection of intellectual property rights, to name just a few.

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, which has governed India since 1998. The winner was a combination of the Congress Party led by the Italian-born Sonia Gandhi, a doctrinaire Marxist blo, 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 coalitions governed by 18 different parties since 1998. The rejection of the Vajpayee government was a straightforward result of the ascendancy of the Congress Party led by the Italian-born Sonia Gandhi, a doctrinaire Marxist blo, and a motley group of regional outfits that have come together to assemble an alternative government.

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 of development. The victory has been interpreted as a rejection of the Vajpayee government’s pro-business policies. “You can’t build highways by the slums,” was the slogan of the BJP. Even the BJP’s own allies were scathing. Dripping with sarcasm, Bal Thackeray, leader of the Sena, thanked Finance Minister Jaswant Singh for promoting the economy more than 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 few commentators joined politicians in interpreting the verdict as a rejection of the Vajpayee government’s pro-business policies. “You can’t build highways by the slums,” was the slogan of the BJP. Even the BJP’s own allies were scathing. Dripping with sarcasm, Bal Thackeray, leader of the Sena, thanked Finance Minister Jaswant Singh for promoting the economy more than Bill Gates than for farmers and mocked for having transformed the state capital Hyderabad into “Cyberabad.”

An already jittery stock market panicked. On Friday, the Bombay Sensex fell 6% in one day and wiped out $2 billion of investors’ wealth. 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 vision of India as one of the five largest economies, a global economic power, and privatization czar Arun Shourie for con- stributing 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 ex- pected to put their regressive stamp on eco- nomic policy. Even better, two left-leaning parties were over, leftists called for an end to the privatization of the public sector, the abol- ishment of the rupee, and the return to a re- view 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 $2 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.

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 recog-
nized 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? Because a District
Workday 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 Re-
publicans are going to have to answer:

Why did the 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 Presi-
don’t 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 hop-
ing the crisis will go away is an effec-
tive strategy. It is the President’s fa-
vorable tactic.

There is another question just begin-
ing to emerge that the President and Republi-
cans will consider radioactive,
that means deny, deny, deny. The ques-
tion is, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker,
why did the President not tell the
American people we were going to re-
institute a military draft? Why did the
Congress not have an opportunity to
debate the issue?

Why did you reinstitute a draft with-
out considering the bill that the gen-
tleman from New York (Mr. RANGEI)
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.

Rumsfeld blind-sid ed the Congress
and the American people and the Su-
preme 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 abuse revelations to 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 draft 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 or-
dered to stay. That is no choice. That
is a de facto military draft.

The President reinstituted a military
draft, but he will not tell the
American people he needs more sol-
diers to fight his war in Iraq because he
has no plan and the fighting gets blood-
ier every day. The President is keeping
soldiers in Iraq 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 Cap-
tol Hill today trying to rally Repub-
licans. Maybe he should draft them.
At least they would see real shared sac-
rifice and shared risk.

Today, America’s minorities bear an
unfair share of the consequences of this
war. The President and the Republi-
cans will not tell us that, they will
say the war is going well, the depart-
ment of war is doing perfectly. Watch
the evening news, read the newspaper,
decide for yourself whether the Presi-
dent’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 volun-
teer or not. That is the definition of a
draft. So, it is going to be a draft. Should the President that he ought to just
come right out and say it, he is going
to draft people anyway 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 gen-
tleman from New Jersey?
There was no objection.

ABORTION EXCRUCIATINGLY
PAINFUL TO UNBORN
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gen-
tleman 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.
Deepak Anand, Director, Division of
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 poss-
sibly 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 sur-
face 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 de-
velop until 32 to 34 weeks of gestation.
Thus, Dr. Anand concludes, a fetus 20
to 32 weeks of gestation would experi-
ence 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, learn-
ing, organizing, and are constantly
striving to regulate themselves, their
environment and their experiences. All preterm infants actively approach and favor experi-
ences that are developmentally sup-
porting and actively avoiding experi-
ences that are disruptive.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, Senator
BROWNBACK and I have introduced leg-
sislation. In the House it is H.R. 4420,
The Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act.
The bill, which now has over two dozen
House sponsors and 22 Senate sponsors,
would require that those performing abor-
tions at or beyond 20 weeks gestation
provide the mother with certain infor-
mation 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 in-
volving 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 physi-
ological structures to feel pain and that
the abortion would likely cause pain to
the unborn child.
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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 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 irrelevent 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, 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 un-born 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 molder 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, 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.

Moreover, 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. DeFazio). 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 after this 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 that it closed 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 three years is that 65 percent of the cuts in tax incentives, we reward those companies that stay in the United States and manufacture. If 100 percent of your manufacturing is in the United States, 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:


GEORGE W. BUSH.


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. As we celebrate the anniversary of the landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision, we are living up to that promise.

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 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 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 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 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 canyon 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 as 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 2004

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 wish 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’s pride and joy. SP Keica 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 met her 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 was injured 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 becoming a father to 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 our 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 are left behind. 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 increase in 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. 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 of the most difficult 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 must 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 in a 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. With much 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, their friends, 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 you 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 overthrown, 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 armed forces 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 concerns about war prevailed, and hundreds of thousands of young Americans now struggle to survive in harm’s way.

With 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 facing 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 and your 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 blunit of this suffering.

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 and family members falling on 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.

May God bless you and keep you in His hands.

In Memoriam and in recognition of brave service to our Country—Operation Iraqi Freedom:


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 at 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, D.C.

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. Therefore, 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.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise 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 freedom of speech.

It is the soldier, not the campus organizer, Who has given us 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 protestor to burn the flag.
Texas Fallen Heroes

Marine Cpl. Richard Arriaga, 20, of San Antonio, Texas. Arriaga was killed in an ambush by small arms fire and rocket propelled grenade in Tikrit, Iraq. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 26, 2004.

Army 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 Division, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Died on April 22, 2003.

Army Pvt. Clayton W. Henson, 20, of Stanton, Texas. Henson died when his convoy was ambushed in Dwayani, Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. Died on April 19, 2003.


Army Chief Warrant Officer Wesley C. Purifoy, 36, of Woodville, Texas. Purifoy died in Baghdad, Iraq when his helicopter was shot down. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 227th Aviation Regiment, 1st Aviation Support Battalion, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 11, 2004.


Army Chief Warrant Officer Wesley C. Purifoy, 36, of Woodville, Texas. Purifoy died in Baghdad, Iraq when his helicopter was shot down. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 227th Aviation Regiment, 1st Aviation Support Battalion, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on April 11, 2004.

Army Spc. Michael G. Karr, Jr., 23, of San Antonio, Texas. Karr died in Baghdad, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device hit his armored personnel carrier. He was assigned to the Army’s 1st Engineer Battalion, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kansas. Died on March 31, 2004.


Army Spc. James M. Kiehl, 22, of Comfort, Texas. Killed in action after his convoy was ambushed in Iraq on March 21. He was assigned to the 507th Maintenance Company, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Army Sgt. Scott Q. Larson, Jr., 22, of Hollywood, Texas. Matula died from hostile fire in Iraq. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 37th Armor Regiment, 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, Ray Croix, Germany, Friedberg, Germany. Died on April 5, 2004.

Army Staff Sgt. Rene Ledesma, 34, of Aheleotla, Texas. Died in a non-combat related accident in Iraq, when an improvised explosive device exploded near his Bradley Fighting Vehicle. He was assigned to 1st Squadron, 7th Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Infantry 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 his vehicle was hit by a roadside bomb. He was a telecommunication specialist with the 1st Battalion, 2nd Infantry Regiment, 1st Infantry Division, Vilseck, Germany. Died on March 19, 2003.

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.


Army Spc. Joseph 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. Died when his Bradley Fighting Vehicle 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, 13th Air Cavalry Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. Died on July 28, 2003.

Army Pfc. Anthony S. Miller, 19, of1errell, 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 6, 2004.

Army Pfc. Stuart W. Moore, 21, of Livingston, Texas. Moore died in Baghdad, Iraq, when his vehicle hit an improvised explosive device while attempting to clear his convoy. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 3rd Field Artillery Regiment, 1st Armored Division, based in Giessen, Germany. Died on July 31, 2004.

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.


Army Spc. Jeffrey L. Mosier, 20, of Houston, Texas. Mosser was on board a CH-47 Chinook Helicopter when it went down in Al Fallujah, Iraq. The cause of the incident is unknown. 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 30, 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 1st Battalion, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division (Mechanized), Fort Carson, Colorado. Died on January 2, 2003.

Army Pfc. James D. Parker, 20, of Bryan, Texas. Parker died in a mortar attack on a forward operating base near Baqubah. He was assigned to the 388th 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 a rocket-propelled grenade and small arms fire hit his armored personnel carrier. He was assigned to Company A, 1st Battalion, 27th Infantry, 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, Kentucky. Died on July 24, 2003.

Army Spc. Jose A. Perez, 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. Lockheed Martin, 20, of Center, Texas. Died when his Bradley Fighting Vehicle struck an improvised explosive device and overturned north of Taji, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 5th Field Artillery Regiment, 1st Infantry Division, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Died on January 21, 2003.


Army Spc. Stephen W. Resendez, 24, of Alvin, Texas. Resendez was killed by enemy small arms fire while manning a vehicle checkpoint in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 2nd Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twenty Ninth Palms, California. Died on May 9, 2004.


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 Expeditionary Force, Twenty Ninth Palms, California. Died on April 1, 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 Marines, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twenty Ninth Palms, California. Died on April 17, 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 a UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters crashed in Mosul, 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 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, 17th 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 Cav- alry, Heilbronn, Germany. Died on September 11, 2003.

OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM


Army Staff Sgt. Brian T. Craig, 27, of Texas. Craig died as the result of an explosion during explosive clearing operations in Qanda, Afghanistan. He was assigned to 70th Explosive Ordnance Detachment, San Diego, California. Died on April 15, 2002.


Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, at the close of business this week, we will journey back home to our bravest sons and daughters.

I would like to take this opportunity today to reflect upon the sacrifices our brave service- men 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. You also know the joy they will feel when they return home to their fami- lies. 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 de- fend the United States, uphold our Constitu- tion, 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 Froshieuser, Pfc. David Kirchoff, Spc. Joshua Knowles, Sgt. Bradley Korthaus, Pvt. Kenneth Nalley, Spc. Aaron Sisael, CWO Brandon Sturdy, brave soldiers who lost their lives serving in Iraq. I thank them for their sac- rifice, and I, along with the rest of our nation, offer my deepest condolences to their families.

God bless our brave and honorable service- men and women and their families. Your sac- rifices will never be forgotten.

Mr. PEARSE. Mr. Speaker. From the troops still in the field today in the deserts of Iraq and mountains of Afghanistan, to the scores of vet- erans who have served in different theaters and eras, Memorial Day is a time to honor these American heroes and celebrate the free- doms that their sacrifices have secured.

This Memorial Day we stand victorious in liberating Iraq and Afghanistan, and our sol- diers have struck another blow against inter- national 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 remem- ber the high price of freedom, as we mourn with the families whose loved ones do not re- turn from the front lines. Memorial Day is a time to honor their lives and their sacrifice.

New Mexico has been reminded that free- dom isn’t free, as we have laid to rest four of our bravest soldiers during this Memorial Day.

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 acci- dent in Afghanistan. She was assigned to the 41st Rescue Squadron, Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Army Spc. Lee D. Tocacheene, 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 Lovingston, NM. He was killed April 6, 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.

Marine Lance Corporal Matthew T. Wright, 29, of Albuquerque, NM. Died while serving with the 4th Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Marine Lance Corporal Cory Hauke, 26, of Madisonville, LA. Died while serving with the 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, NC.

Marine Lance Corporal Jeremy J. Miranda, 26, of Lakewood, CA. Died while serving with the 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Marine Lance Corporal Jeremy D. Blanchard, 27, of San Diego, CA. Died while serving with the 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, at Camp Pendleton, CA.

Marine Lance Corporal Brandon D. Davis, 24, of San Antonio, TX. Died while serving with the 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

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 eter- nal responsibility 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 impor- tant: 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, Nebraska; Pvt. Noah L. Boye, 21, of Grand Is- land, Nebraska; Sgt. Cory R. Mracek, 26, of Hay Springs, Nebraska; Sgt. Dennis A. Corral, 33, of Kearney, Nebraska; Spc. James R. Wolt, 21, of South Sioux City, Nebraska; Spc. Blake C. Kitch, 19, of Columbus, Nebraska; and Army Of- ficer 3rd Class David J. Moreno, 26, of 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 char- acter, commitment and sacrifice of these brave men and women.

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 he- roes, ceremonies are held and Americans all over this great 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 demo- cratic 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 expres- sion—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
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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 need fear invasion from its neighbors in terms of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

Memorial Day is a day when we should re-member 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 soldiers 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 how these families are going through. But they can be assured that Americans will forever re-member their loved ones with pride and grate-fulness.

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 re-member 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Rank and name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-Mar-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. Howard Johnson II</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pvt. Kelley S. Prevost</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Apr-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. John E. Brown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Robert William Channell, Jr.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Jun-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Cedric L. Lawrence</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Jun-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Timothy M. Greener</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jul-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1st Lt. Todd J. Braut</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Tech. Sgt. Bruce E. Brower</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Oct-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Audry D. Bell</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Charles G. Haught</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Philip G. Johnson, Jr.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Brian D. Hamilton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Feb-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Christopher M. Taylor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Ahmed A. Gaddin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Stephen D. Hill</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Mar-03</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Hospital Corpsman 1st Class Michael Vann Johnson</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Sep-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. Brandon D. Smith</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Mar-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. 1st Class William W. Labadie, Jr.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Stacy C. Brandon</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Arthur L. Felker</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Fernando Padilla-Ramirez</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-May-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Michael J. Williams</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. William T. Latham</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Jun-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spec. Issac Campoy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Michael J. Williams</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Command Sgt. Major Eric F. Cooke</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgts. Michael M. Merik</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Feb-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Matthew C. Laszowski</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Robert P. Zahnle, Jr.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-May-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Michael A. Gitto</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Patrick T. O'Day</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. David L. Perry</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel R. Parker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Alan J. Jones-Huffman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Pablo Manzano</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Jose E. Mora</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Michael H. Scaselli</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>2nd Lt. Todd J. Braut</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Paul A. Velasquez</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Spec. Jerrod Risic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>1st Sgt. Kyle Boly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>CW2 Christopher G. Nasics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3505
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Rank and name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Stephen A. Bertolino</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Orange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>2nd Lt. Ryan C. Young</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Laguna Hills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Aaron R. Clark</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Chico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Steven M. Bridges</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Tips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Richard A. Burdick</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>National City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Michael G. Wilhelmes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Jose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Justin W. Pollard</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Foothill Ranch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. Jesse D. Mizer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Auburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Michael A. DiRaimondo</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Scott Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Jaron K. Chapple</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Hermitage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Edna M. Mareskov</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Clemente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Master Sgt. Jude C. Mariano</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Vinyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Feb-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Patrick T. Taich</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Oceanside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Christopher K. Hill</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Arleta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Lt. Michael W. Vega</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Lathrop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Casey Sheehan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Arleta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Marcus M. Cherry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Imperial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. R酪e D. Cowley</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Ramon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Travis J. Layfield</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Fremont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Allan K. Walker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. William M. Harrell</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Placentia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. George D. Torres</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Long Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Victor A. Rosaleskow</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bridgeport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Brian M. Wood</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Escondido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Richard J. Gannett II</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Lipan Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Maj. Christopher A. Bisbee</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Aurora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. Lemmy Harris-Kelly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Riverside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Abraham D. Pimentelina</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James L. Beckstrand</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Escondido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Adam W. Long</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Campbell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. Ryan A. Reed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Compton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Ryan P. Long</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Aurora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Barry D. Brooks</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Arvada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Ryan S. Martin</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Centennial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Travis T. Arroyo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Lancaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Brian A. Warfield</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Newark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Ryan S. Eaton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Greeley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Robert D. Neff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Waterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Eric E. Paulsen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Waterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel H. Salcido</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Cocoa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Cpl. Armando Ariel Gonzalez</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>West Palm Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. John T. Rivero</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Tampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Michael D. Quinn</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Tampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Maj. Mark D. Taylor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Tampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Robert A. Wiese</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Richard S. Eaton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Omar A. Jones</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>West Palm Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Robert D. Roberts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Fort Walton Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Steven M. Scorpio</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Ryan S. Martin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>St. Petersburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel H. Salcido</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Fort Walton Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel H. Salcido</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel H. Salcido</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel H. Salcido</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel H. Salcido</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Petty Officer 3rd Class Michael J. Brown</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Petty Officer 2nd Class Mark W. Depp</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Petty Officer 3rd Class Ronald A. Senter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Petty Officer 2nd Class Robert D. Jenkins</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Petty Officer 2nd Class Scott M. Lichten</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Capt. John E. Trimble</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Rank and name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pvt. Michael Russell Crighton Weldon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Macon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1st Lt. Edward J. Kern</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. David T. Nott</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Blackshear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Ronald H. Conerly</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Waycross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Michael T. Crockett</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Valdosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Nathan B. Napier Jr.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Ssgt. T. Bob C. Franklin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Mineral Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pvt. Benjamin L. Freeman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Valdosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Command Sgt. Maj. Jerry L. Johnson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Ssgt. Marcus J. Hollingsworth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Americus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Nathaniel H. Johnson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Ricksy L. Crockett</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. William J. Norman</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Master Sgt. Thomas R. Haggan, Sr.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. William R. Strong</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Kennesaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Antoine J. Holt</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Austell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgts. Andrew J. Cormier</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. Anthony D. Chambers &amp; Ssgt. Christopher M. Dickerson</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Cameron W. Damus</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Pahoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Bradley G. Northcutt</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Davenport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Gunnery Sgt. Jeffrey E. Behr, Jr</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Ossian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. David P. Fischer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. David W. Wrothoff</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>West Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Cpl. Robert L. McKinley</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Dubuque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Ryan Anthony Beausire</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Andrew M. Pakorny</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. Michael A. Ely</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Miner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Andrew D. Slavens</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Delaraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Duane R. Rose</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Don R. Schutte</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Lincoln Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Charles A. Smith</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Batesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. Thomas J. Sousa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Nathaniel Hart, Jr</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Ssgt. Ronald D. Allen Jr.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Ssgt. Nathan A. Knievel</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Chad L. Keith</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Evansville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Spc. Chad L. Keith</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. Robert L. McKinley</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Ssgt. James L. Pender</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pfc. William D. Bellard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Rank and name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Aug-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Levi B. Kinchen</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Tickfaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Aug-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Todd G. Kingsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Michael E. Streeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Muskogee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. David E. Streeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Muskogee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Spc. Mark E. Streeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Muskogee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Craig D. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Mar-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Gregory W. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. T. W. Maletko</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Spc. Mathew G. Boule</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Benjamin E. Samsalis</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. John M. McShan</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jul-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Justin W. Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Joseph C. Cameron</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Oct-03</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Sgt. Joseph P. Bellavia</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. John D. Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Kyran E. Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Dena L. Allora</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Luke F. Perlowski</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Jan-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Gabriel J. Palacios</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Feb-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Stephen M. Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Daniel J. Ljonda</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Mar-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. David M. Vercosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Kendall D. Waters-Bey</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. K. Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Jason David M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Jeffery J. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Lt. Adam G. Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Feb-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pvt. Bryan N. Spoy</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Jack C. Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pvt. Brandon L. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Bruce C. Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Capt. Thomas A. Robin</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Daniel J. Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Shane T. Swarthout</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Joseph M. Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Dennis D. Geirma</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Lawrence A. Koshiwski</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Maj. Ken Nuffin</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Michael J. Potter</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Oct-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Stephen H. Haller</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Holly A. McLeod</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Richard K. Teichich</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Jul-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Jason J. Nantep</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Nov-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Dale A. Parcht</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jun-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Brett J. Tipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Jul-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Paul J. Cassidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Brian R. Hellenmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Trevor A. Bluester</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Donald L. Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Paul J. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Arminia D. Brickfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Thomas D. Slapchuck</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Stephen H. Haller</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Jonathan R. Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. James L. Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Joseph J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Warrant Officer Michael T. Blaise</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sqt. 1st Class Richard S. Gottfried</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Kenneth A. Melton</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Ryan M. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>2nd Lt. Thirio S. Childers</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Cpl. Henry L. Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Larry R. Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-May-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Kenneth R. Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jun-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Jonathan W. Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Joe N. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Joseph B. Krueger</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. David A. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Ralph D. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Mar-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Cloyd D. Ferrie</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Christopher D. Mobley</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Jeffrey F. Dayton</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lcpl. Joseph S. Laid</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Michael J. Ladd</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Richard G. Ladd</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Brian E. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Alan D. Hammel</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Jun-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Michael L. Tozzo</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jul-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Cpl. David R. Parson</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jul-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Cpl. Mark A. Bibby</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Aug-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. James I. Loseth</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Leonard D. Simmons</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. John B. Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Joseph R. Guerrero</td>
<td></td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Rank and name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Scott C. Rose</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pvt. Anthony E. Arnold</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Feb-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1st Lt. Joseph F. Carusone</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Robert S. Cantos</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Asheville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Robert L. Wicker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Burien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. John D. Hight</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Douglas H. Ward</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-May-05</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Robert S. Marks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Jul-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. John T. Rust</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Robert A. Trotter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-06</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Freedom L. White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-May-05</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. John M. Smith</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Oct-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Butts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. Jason M. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James R. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jan-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Dec-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jul-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Oct-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Oct-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Oct-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Oct-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Spc. James A. Smith</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Rank and name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nov-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Sgt. Ross A. Pennamen</td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Allegheny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jan-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pfc. L. E. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Oklahoma City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Lawrence S. Colton</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Okmulgee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Scott M. Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Enid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Erickson R. Petty</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Fort Gibson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Mar-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Donald Ralph Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Muskogee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Aamir C. Contreras</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Shreveport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Robert A. Stowe</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Okmulgee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Cpl. Travis J. Bradach-Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Christopher J. Riviere Wesley</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Portland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Erickson R. Petty</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Fort Gibson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Frank J. Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Tulsa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. James E. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Oklahoma City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. James E. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Muskogee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Lance Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Michael A. Strack</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Scott H. Stowe</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Steven E. Strome</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. James E. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Lance C. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Scott J. Stowe</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. William J. Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bartlesville.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-Apr-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Brett L. Morel</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Apr-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Capt. Dan S. McManus</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Apr-04</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Christopher E. Watts</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-May-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Todd E. Nunes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-May-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Lance Cpl. Jeremiah E. Stauff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Compton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-May-04</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Brian Matthew Kennedy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-May-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Joseph Antonio Villalamata</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. James M. Kiel</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Granbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Edward J. Aquino</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Pvt. Ruben Estrella-Soto</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Mar-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Scott J. Janssen</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Eagle Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Mar-04</td>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>Capt. Eric B. Das</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Del Rio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Sgt. Anthony Miller</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Andrew Todd Arnold</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-May-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Lee J. Garcia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Robstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-May-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Sylvia A. Scott, Jr.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>2nd Lt. Jeffrey J. Kaylor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Eagle Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Pet. Robert L. Frantz</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Colleyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jun-03</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Capt. Christian C. Schulz</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jul-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Hector E. Perez</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Mar-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. Dennis R. Hynes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Jun-04</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. James E. Holley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Paul J. Johnson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff Sgt. John G. Shamburger</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Oct-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. Joseph W. Russell</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Nov-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Capt. John Russell</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Chief Warrant Officer Clarence E. Boone</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>2nd Lt. Jose L. Birkett</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Dec-03</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Staff with names and rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with additional entries for various branches and states, but the format is consistent with the entries shown. The entries include dates ranging from April to December 2003 and 2004, with states such as TX, VA, UT, and WA, and locations including Houston, Fort Worth, San Antonio, and others.
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 is a most appropriate way 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 in uniform to defend our freedoms and our 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 bill to restore earned and promised 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 name.

Sergeant Johnson, a 29-year-old from Calumet, was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment 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 Luce County, was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment 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
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tion 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 never forgets 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 served in the military service during World War II. The sacrifices of all those who have proudly served our nation, 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 five from my district.

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 re-
dedicate itself to improved services and benefits for our veterans and their families.
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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. In junior high school, he dreamed of being a Marine and his wish came true 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 near 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—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 hero. He is one of those who have given life or limb for their selfless service and sacrifice to our country. Our thoughts are with the family and friends of 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, purple heart ribbons, will mark the 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 is 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 Ramadi, 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 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, we remember 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 embody 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 in the presence of 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 when 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 our 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 he entered the service in the Middle East, where his fellow reservists described him as an energetic, mission-oriented young Delawarean who graduated from Seafood High School in June of 1999, rational young Delawarean who graduated from 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 terrorism.

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 a member of the third battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment. He had served in the Middle East as nothing else has, before or since.

Mr. Speaker, during Memorial Day, I would like to raise in honor of a courageous young soldier who died September 7, 2003, of injuries suffered August 30 when the truck he was driving in Fort Campbell, Kentucky 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 young Delawarean who graduated from Seafood High School in June of 1999, rational young Delawarean who graduated from 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 terrorism.

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 in February.

At only 21 years of age, Ryan was an inspirational young Delaworean 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 terrorism.
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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, as we visit the Gary 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 few 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 Iraq conflict to date: Specialist Jason Ford, Command Sergeant Major Cornell Gilmore, Captain Jason David Mielo, Specialist George A. Mitchell, First Lieutenant Adam G. Mooney, Sergeant Jeffery Walker, and Staff Sergeant Kendall Damon Waters-Bay. Congress must honor the brave men and women who have given the ultimate sacrifice so bravely in Europe and the Pacific for the defense of this land. From the beaches of Normandy 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, in a war that has been described as America’s 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 heartfelt 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 borne 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 remember 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 gave 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, Specialist Nathan Joseph Corbera of Sherwood, Staff Sergeant Robert Anthony Stever of Pendleton, Corporal Travis J. Bradachnull of Multnomah County, Chief Warrant Officer Erik C. Kesterson of Independence, Specialist Joseph M. Blickenstein of Corvallis, Specialist Matthew W. Nakas of Corvallis, Specialist Christopher Jude Weideman of Portland, Sergeant Travis A. Moorthart of Browns-ville, 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 American families still in mourning 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 servicewoman who lost her 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.
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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 Qaeda 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 Qaeda, and now in Iraq, is becoming longer than ever before. 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 spend their lives with the military 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 Qaeda 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 defense.

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 and all their families today and always. Our South Texas heroes:

Killed aboard the USS Cole: Petty Officer 3rd Class Ronaldo Santiago, 22, from Kingsville and Fireman Gary Sweeney (Howell), 28, from Rockport, TX
Army Spc. Edward J. Anguiano, 24, from Los Palacios
Army Spc. Anthony F. Padilla, 21, from Edinburg
Army Spc. John P. Lopez, 21, from Harlingen
Air National Guard Maj. of the Army, Jack Tilley.

Pvt. Juan Guadalupe Garza Jr., 20, 1st Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division from South Texas killed in action on April 8, 2003, in central Iraq
Staff Sgt. Hector R. Perez, 40, 1st Battalion, 227th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) from the village of Corpus Christi; he was killed when his military convoy came under fire near Hafid, Iraq, on July 4, 2003
Spc. Jose A. Perez III, 22, 6th Battalion, 27th Field Artillery Regiment, 18th Field Artillery Brigade, from San Diego, Texas; he died in an ambush of a convoy on May 26, 2003, in Tallil
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 mid-air 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 on May 10 from injuries sustained in enemy fire in Al Anbar Province, Iraq, on April 1, 2004
Lance Cpl. Ruben Valdez Jr., 21, 3rd Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, from Corpus Christi, Texas; 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, many from California’s past generations of service, and others—have left their homes 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 know 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 country is to provide 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 commend our fallen heroes and to pay tribute to those 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.

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, PFC Farao Kevin Letufuaga died in Mosul, Iraq, and it was with heavy hearts that CSM Luniolasolua Savusa and I accompanied his body home. Specialist Letufuaga served as a member of the 101st Airborne Division. He is the son of Mr. Fetiine’ia and Siniva Letufuaga of Aolau, 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 25 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 and was invited 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 Letufuaga and Private Falaniko, I rise today to say that these two young men lived and died honorably as true Samoan warriors. Their sacrifice is a reminder of our nation’s commitment to protect American freedoms.

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, to those of 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 the fallen.

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 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.


Pfc Jason M. Meyer, U.S. Army or Swartz Creek, MI, killed in action when struck by mortar fire on April 8, 2003.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to 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, but especially 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.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize 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: Sgt Bert Hoyer, PVC Nicholas Frye, Maj Christopher Splinter, Sgt Warren Hansen, Sgt Eugene Uhll III, 2nd Lt Jeremy Wolf, Pfc Rachel Bowser, SPC David Gabrielson, Maj Mathew Schram, Sgt Kirk Straske, Capt John Kurfth, Pfc Sean Schneider, CPL Jesse Thiry, Pfc Ryan Jerabeik, SPC Michelle Witmer, Sgt Michael McGlothin, PO Michael Anderson, and SPC Robert Book.

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 freedom. 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 Perry D. Scott of Concrete, Washington; Army Specialist Juan M. Ridout of Silverdale, Washington; and Army Specialist Nathan W. Nakis of Sedro-Woolley, Washington.

You will not be forgotten.

Mr. MARKY. 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 are making 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 freedom and our way of life. This Communion and the Cold War have faded into history’s mists, radical and dangerous new groups and individuals are ready to test the willingness of America to defend itself. The sacrifices of our sons and daughters fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq demonstrate that when the duty calls, America is ready.

The sacrifice 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 the future generation 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 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.

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 hero 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 defend our freedom and their families and loved ones. 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.

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 enjoy the peace we have today. 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 36th 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 in 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 Republic of Vietnam 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 extraordinaire 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, 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 security.

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, 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 Dusenberg, 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 Memorial Day week, we honor their memories and remember those 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 Staff Sergeant, Specialist Edward J. Kom of Savannah.
- U.S. Army Specialist David T. Nutt of Blackshear.
- U.S. Army Specialist John K. Kinesmith of Stockbridge.
- U.S. Army Staff Sgt. Michael T Crockett of Soperton.
- U.S. Army Staff 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 Specialist Marshall Edgeron of Rocky Face.
- U.S. Army Specialist Christopher J. Holland of Brunswick.
- U.S. Army Specialist Nathanial H. Johnson of Augusta.
- U.S. Army Staff Sgt. Ricky L. Crockett of Broxton.
- U.S. Army Specialist William R. Strange of Adairville.
- 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.

Mr. 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 southwestern Iraq.

Sgt. Robbins is survived by his wife, Gina, their beautiful daughter, Martisa, his father, Douglas, and mother, Charlene.

I know the pain of such a tremendous loss. In August of 2010, 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 turret gunner, Sgt. McNulty, a medic in the Navy, transferred to the Marine Corps, had been out in the field in Quang Nam province chasing up his buddies when he stepped on a land mine and lost his life. Our family misses him every day.

Mr. Speaker, today on 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.
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 in his final deployment 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 was very proud of the idea of cutting the grass.” His brother 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 America.” 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. service men killed January 29, 2004 in an explosion in Ghazi, Afghanistan, about sixty miles south west 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 Glennville, 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. “Colgan had been in the U.S. Army 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 Colorado, survived him. Givens was with the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment. His siblings live in Joplin and Springfield.

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— 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, Congressmen Rangel andCongressman Walsh, for offering their support 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, we do not lose sight of the brave veterans 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 reducing the benefits of 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 added funding is 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. 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 commend Jack Colgan of the Greenwood Community Church near Southwest City, Missouri, described his son as a “strong boy, who was very proud of the idea of cutting the grass.” His brother said, “He died doing what he wanted to do.” Jonathan Barnes was survived by his wife Amanda and daughter Michelle of Goodman, Missouri.

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 commend Jack Colgan of the Greenwood Community Church near Southwest City, Missouri, described his son as a “strong boy, who was very proud of the idea of cutting the grass.” His brother said, “He died doing what he wanted to do.” Jonathan Barnes was survived by his wife Amanda and daughter Michelle of Goodman, Missouri.
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.


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 sympathy to their families and friends. Young leaders like these exemplify the spirit 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 enhanced our security and protect our liberties; and to plot, plan, and mastermind another event like September 11 in our country. 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 to 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. 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 because 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 marital status. For you and me, for each man, woman, and child in this country, the ultimate sacrifice defending our Nation.

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 approach Memorial Day, I ask that we remember and 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 Hoosier veterans and the war dead is to revere what they fought and died to preserve:
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.

Mr. GOODE. 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 Alfonso Sandoval, Jr., died in Iraq on March 26, 2004; and


No words can express our gratitude for the sacrifices these young men made to defend our country and honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice.

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 because 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 marital status. For you and me, for each man, woman, and child in this country, the ultimate sacrifice defending our Nation.

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 approach Memorial Day, I ask that we remember and 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 Hoosier veterans and the war dead is to revere what they fought and died to preserve:
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.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, 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 to 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 the sacrifices of our 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 were just 19 years old. Their stories make us proud to represent 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.

Mr. GOODE. 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 Alfonso Sandoval, Jr., died in Iraq on March 26, 2004; and


No words can express our gratitude for the sacrifices these young men made to defend our country and honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice.

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.
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 partici- pants of this secret task force came together to advise the 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.

Increasingly, we hear 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 single mom, 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 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 Republican bill 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 fuel costs for American consumers and businesses alike.

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 they need to dole out more cash to fill their gas tanks with the little disposable income that they have left; they are being 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 single mom, 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, 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 Strategic 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 since 2002, 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 last year 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 translates into 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 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 in 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 Republican liberals 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 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 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 Chevron, Marathon, Sunoco, and Tesoro, control 76.5 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 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, seems they like it; they are completely dis-regarding 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, the administration was 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, 250 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 oil. President Bush has extended for another 4 years the dual-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 on an Energy Efficient Economy, this means that we 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 example, 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 and other environmental groups asked the court to release this information. The Bush administration asked the court to shield the Bush administration from scrutiny of Bush administration’s destructive energy policy.

In response to that suit, a district court ordered the administration to provide information about participation from those 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. Former White House counsel John Dean testified before the Vice President do? He appealed the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, and in December the Supreme Court agreed to
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 think 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 on this subject that have said that Justice Scalia is one of the potential conflict of interest. And I would just like to mention some of those questions again tonight before I close.

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.

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 this 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 I do know one thing clearly, and that is the Energy 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 energy prices, 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.

Mrs. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for taking the time to very deliberately 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 thinking about 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 all got to the bottom of the truth, 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 renewable energy, 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 congressional grantees 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 hear 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 area of great importance but on the Committee on the Judiciary, that 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. FALLONE, Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentlewoman is saying, because I think it is important to know what happened behind closed doors in this 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 the fact 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 drafted 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 would have been 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 interest of the American people in mind.

So that is the issue that I would like to bring out tonight.
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 really.

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 respect. We need both parties.

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, that at the end of the session, 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 want to hear the ranking member eloquently announce the difference 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 gentlewoman from California or for the Member from Texas.

It is, frankly, to make this a working legislative initiative that will actually pass through, 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 energy policy, we have seen 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 oversight. Even though the Republicans are 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 independent, 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 any way 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, 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 were there 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 you must show that we have over seen. 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 that is not the American way.

And at the end of it, she did not know the Subcommittee on Health on the drug cards. And, of course, it was a hearing that was requested by the Republicans. 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.

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 Republicans. 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.

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 program. They 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 hearing 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.
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; you try to get 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 is not buying gold 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. Margaret makes the floor of $8,500 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 was a shame that she would be 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 doing with her child? How is she going 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 support 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 had an initiative, the House, that we had an initiative, the Democrats, and it it worked. It was paid for. It did not leave 3 million people behind. It gave to those making between $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.
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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 it to be unwise 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 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 what you see 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’ views. I mean, 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 supporting us, which is essentially saying that you can act unilaterally and that you can act with impunity without being adhered to this treaty. And I think that has 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 to people for people for a time when the middle-class person is hurting and they probably need some help from the Federal Government for some of these things.

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 to go to the Senate 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 fact 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 countries, 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 not the rule that the majority — 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 did we use 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 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 that and working together, mention 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.

There 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 gentleman 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 the 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, something this is a little different, the treatment that the treatment that they are coming under the Geneva Convention in Afghanistan. But then somehow you lead from that to say, well, then, the Iraqis...
The Speaker pro tempore (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 conditions 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, only to have their visas approved by INS after they rented apartments, found employment and became jackers to slip through our borders, only to have their visas approved by INS after they rented apartments, found employment and became the predicate to 9/11.

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.

In addition, Homeland Security has been trained in weapons of mass destruction, awareness and response since September 11, 2001.

YES, WE ARE BETTER OFF NOW THAN WE WERE FOUR YEARS AGO
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 recessions.

Americans are seeing the benefit of the Republican growth 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.

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 workers 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 averages 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 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 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 charge, the reason working poor 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 Americans would still 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 oppression 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, Medicare 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 legislation 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. The first 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 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. For the next weeks that the 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 America’s workers so they 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 incentives.

And we are going to address law suit 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 shoes. 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 herald for 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,
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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 divided 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 $754 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 pre-tax profits, here again, the diversity 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 $689 billion. So we can see this is a 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 regulatory burden by undertaking 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 do not have the time or 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 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, many regulations have 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 weeks, after we return from recess, to take a recess 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 and unnecessary 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.

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 2001 through 2002, 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 sized $25 billion in 2002 alone. The 6.2 billion dollars in 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.

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 over the Carter administration, 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 from 250 ways to do business to 2130 ways to 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 and remove the stifling of 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.

We 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 of 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 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, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

According to a study done by the Manufacturing Alliance, entitled “How Structural Costs Impose 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 cost of the 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 ourselves would be 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 the process to 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 commended, the Republican Congress is committed to reducing 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 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 criterion 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 slowdowns in the 1970s was directly attributable to regulations imposed by OSHA, and nearly half of those slowdowns 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 innovation in American industry.

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 the heavy hand of regulation and misguided oversight. The affliction to which I am referring is an insatiable appetite for too much control of the
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 said because they were never there. They were afraid to go to the work site in fear of being fined by OSHA.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Norwood) has been a leader in the fight to keep American businesses competitive, to protect America's 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.

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 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 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 stepped on an area that was authorized by Congress in the Occupational Safety and Health 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 only to the employer who has exposed their employee to that 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 lead to a proactive and 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 the community 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 performance measurement tool 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 limited and 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. This approach-regulatory or paper-work 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 business.

I 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 taxpayer-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 in that it deals strictly with military bases, whereas H.R. 3213 will establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of all Federal agencies and programs and recommend the realignment or elimination 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 log-rolling that normally boggs 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-fuelling and increasing spending in 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, two each from the House and Senate. The mission to conduct a comprehensive review of all Federal agencies and programs, excepting the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy, which if sold to taxpayers 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 as politically sensitive a forum. 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 recommendations 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, or be used for supporting other domestic programs or paying down the national debt.

H.R. 3213 is a unique opportunity rather than simply keeping the same amount of money spent. It is my intent to bring jobs back to 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 a plan 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 reducing the burden of the lawsuits that come and haunt them?

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 be a part of 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:

8229. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Orchids of the Genus Phalaenopsis From Taiwan in Growing Media (Docket No. 98-086-S) (RIN: 0579-AB75), received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8230. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyard Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Diagnostic Services User Fees (Docket No. O-024-2) (RIN: 0579-AR22), received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8231. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle; Additions to the Genus Phalaenopsis From Taiwan in Growing Media (Docket No. 03-052-1) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8232. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Diagnostic Services User Fees (RIN: 0579-AD80) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8233. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California (Docket No. FRL-7656-1) received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8234. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Finding of Failure to Submit Required State Implementation Plans for the Metropolitan Washington, DC ozone Non-attainment Area; Maryland (MD18-3110; FRL-7656-6) 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—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Illinois (IL221-1a; FRL-7675-8) 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—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program (Region II Docket No. NJA8-275; FRL-7661-1) received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8237. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Connecticut (CT477-1; FRL-7658-9) 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 State Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program (Region II Docket No. NJA8-275; 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 State Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program (Region II Docket No. NJA8-275; FRL-7661-1) received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


8241. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Improvement Plans; Missouri—The 2005 ROP Plan for the Missouri Portion of the St. Louis Air Quality Nonattainment Area (Docket No. MO-061-2; FRL-7680-6) 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, concerning a report concerning Cuban emigration policies, pursuant to Public Law 105-257, section 8, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, concerning a report concerning the threat of attacks on U.S. facilities endangering the lives of U.S. Government civilians, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

8245. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, concerning a report concerning the threat of attacks on U.S. facilities endangering the lives of U.S. Government civilians, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

8246. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, concerning a report concerning the threat of attacks on U.S. facilities endangering the lives of U.S. Government civilians, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

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 Report to Congress for the Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8248. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002, the Office of Inspector 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.


8250. A letter from the Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on denial of visas to Conspirators of American Property, pursuant to Public Law 105-377, section 306; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.


8252. 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-AA90) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8253. 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.

824. 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.

825. 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.

826. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Neck Point, Long Island Sound, 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.

827. 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.


829. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; San Francisco Bay, Marin County, CA. [CGD00-04-017] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

830. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulations; Marie Island Strait, Napa River, Vallejo, 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.


832. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, miles 1062.6 and 1064.0 in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FL. [CGD07-03-186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

833. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia. [CGD01-04-035] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

834. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; 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.


836. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Loxahatchee River, Palm Beach 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.

837. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, miles 1062.6 and 1064.0 in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FL. [CGD07-03-186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

838. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Illinois Waterway, Joliet, IL. [CGD01-04-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

839. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, miles 1062.6 and 1064.0 in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FL. [CGD07-03-186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

840. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulated Navigation Areas; Illinois Waterway, Joliet, IL. [CGD01-04-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
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. 108-151, 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. 3247. 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 23, 2004.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GINGRER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):
H.R. 4409. A bill to authorize 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. KELLEHER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KOLBE, 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. KOSAK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WILSON of New Mexico):
H.R. 4410. A bill to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for high- ly qualified teachers serving in mathematics, science, and special education and for reading specialists; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOBSON (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. SENSENBRINNER (for himself and Mr. CONVERS):
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. MEINK of Florida (for himself, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LOBETRA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FIERRO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROBOP, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. JACKSON-LANDERS of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANGBYN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SKELO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAPP, Mr. NADLING, Mr. RENAL-AL- LARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MALONY, 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 ‘‘special knowledge’’ requirement for a non-immigrant status as an intracompany transferee, to impose an annual numerical limitation on nonimmigrant visas for such transferees, and to impose a fee for the purpose; 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. ZIEHLIKE:
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. SENSENBRINNER (for himself, Mr. CONVERS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOST, Mr. JACKSON-LANDERS, Mr. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. KILPATRICK):
H.R. 4417. A bill to modify certain deadlines pertaining to machine-readable, tamper-resistant, fireproof, anti-fraud enhancements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. RAN-CHEL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. RAMPSTAD):
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, and for 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. HOOLY of Oregon, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. DEFZAD):
H.R. 4419. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for wildland firefighting costs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PETTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TIHANYI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. NEGREZ of Arizona, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. AKIN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BASS of Georgia, Mr. BrABSON of Iowa, Mr. TANCRED 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 the Food and Drug Administration, 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. EDWARDS:
H.R. 4425. A bill making appropriations for the Foreign Operations Administration and the Department of State 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. 4426. 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. TANG, Mr. GILL, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MANNING, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROCUS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BEIDELMAN, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. HILL of Virginia, and Mr. PELSO):
H.R. 4427. 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. ACKERMANN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FONSELLA, Mrs. MALONY, Mr. RANZEL, Mr. SIRIANO, Mr. ENORL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SWENNY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HINCHELY, Mr. MCDOUG, Mr. BOHELL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HOUCHT)
H.R. 4428. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve 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.
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 products made in the United States; to the Committee on Ways andMeans.

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. BARIETT of South Carolina, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WATTE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DE MINT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HENSAKING, Mr. HORKSTRA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MCDONALD of Washington, Ms. MUSKOVITZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NuUERBAUER, Mrs. NORTHRUP, Mr. NOORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PENNISI, Mr. PHILIPS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend section 58 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 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 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. MEGHAN):

H.R. 4433. A bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with 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. RANGEL 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. FELOSI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JOHNS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HERNANDEZ of Florida, Mr. BECKETT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SANTROZI of California, and Mr. WYNN):

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 program and to direct the Commissioner of Social Security to appoint a task force to provide recommendations, and a credit for individuals with cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and a credit for individuals with cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, for individuals who have received a diagnosis of AIDS; 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. BOWSER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, 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. SHADROG, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. HENRY):

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. GALLEGGY (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 of deportability, 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 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 "Guardsmen 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. REFFLEY (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 the historic preservation fund; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. BORKINER, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. TASHPT):

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; 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. EVANS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4445. A bill to rescind 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. KAPTR (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, to establish a program of grants to support farm and non-farm food deserts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 4447. A bill to revise the boundary of the Poe-Bowie National Wildlife Refuge, 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, Mr. BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EWING, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BERNSTEIN of California, Mr. KASTENHENKE of Wisconsin, Mr. NELLENBURG, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHRY, 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. 4455. A bill to require access to physicians in medically underserved areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
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. 114 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 conduct as thorough a clean-up and removal of ordinance 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; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

334. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 51 memorializing the United States Congress to support the passage of S. 68 to improve benefits for certain Filipino veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

335. Also, a memorial 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 of 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. 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. Andrew, Mr. Engel, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Hoolihan 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. Borelli, Mr. Hulshof, Mr. Barton of Texas, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Baker, Mrs. Cubin, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Hostetler, Mr. Brady of Texas, Mr. Garret of New Jersey, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Bereuter, Mrs. Northup, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Cantor, Mr. Ramirez, Mr. H. Akin of California, Mrs. Norton, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Wexler, Ms. Berman, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Payne, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Wexler, Ms. Hoolihan of Oregon, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Lantos, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Lanchyn, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Sario, 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. 4350: Mr. Owens.
H.R. 4359: Mr. Boreman.
H.R. 4365: Ms. Harris, Mr. Kinojosa, 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. Carper, Ms. Granger, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin, Mr. Paul, Mr. Neugebauer, Mr. Delay, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Simmons, Mrs. Biggers, and Mr. Stenholm.
H.R. 4372: Mr. Ford, Mr. Holt, Mr. Pence, Mr. Michael, and Mr. Levin.
H.R. 4332: Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
H.R. 4333: Mr. Burton of Indiana.
H.R. 4379: Mr. LaHood and Mr. Oxley.
H.R. 4382: Ms. McCarthy of Missouri, and Mr. Green of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4352: Mr. Owens, Mr. Gutierrez, and Mr. Deutch.
H.R. 4358: Mr. Rogers of Alabama.
H.R. 4306: Mr. Moran of Virginia and Mrs. Maloney.
H.R. 4356: Ms. Ros-Lehtinen and Ms. Pryce of Ohio.
H.R. 4343: Ms. Pelosi.
H.R. 4344: Mr. Pomroy and Mrs. Cubin.
H.R. 4345: Mr. Bilirakis.
H.R. 4346: Mr. Breyer, 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. Hoolihan of Oregon, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Lantos, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Lanchyn, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Sario, and Mr. Delahunt.

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 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.
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.
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.


Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5893–S6049

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills were introduced as follows: S. 2451–2472.

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. 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.

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.

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.

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.

Older Americans Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 355, designating May 2004, as “Older Americans Month”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

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.  

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.  

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:  

Pending:  

- Graham (SC) Amendment No. 3170, to provide for the treatment by the Department of Energy of waste material.  
- Crapo Amendment No. 3226 (to Amendment No. 3170), of a perfecting nature.  
- 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.  

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)  
- Transmitting, pursuant to law, the United States Arctic Research Plan; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs. (PM–79)  
- 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)  

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.  
- 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.  

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)  
- 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.

Messages From the House:

Measures Placed on Calendar:

Measures Read First Time:

Executive Communications:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cospromsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Authority for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—103)

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

EXTRAUST 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, Jr., 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, Nasselle, 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.

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 Waste-water 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).

Chaplain: The prayer was offered today by Rev. Michael Bentley, Pastor, First Baptist Church in Brevard, North Carolina.


House Parliamentarian Appointed: The Speaker appointed John V. Sullivan as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives to succeed Charles W. Johnson, resigned.

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


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.

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.

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);

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 firefighting efforts 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;

Wamp amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 108–499) that makes changes to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; and Pages H3418–27

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).

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

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).

The Clerk was authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the bill.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

H. Res. 644, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to by a voice vote.

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.

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.

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.

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, June 2.

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.

President 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

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.


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.

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.