



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2004

No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rabbi Joui Hessel, Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

God of all people, we thank You for all that is good in our world. We acknowledge Your sovereignty and everlasting presence in our lives. Bless us as we commit ourselves to continuing Your work of creation. For our commitment to social justice and peace is our task, and You our guide.

Allow our Nation's leaders and its citizens the opportunity to work together in an effort to create a world filled with righteousness and peace. Bless our magnificent country, that it may always be a stronghold of peace and its advocate among the Nations. May satisfaction reign within its borders, health and happiness within our homes. Strengthen our relationships among the inhabitants of all lands, so that we may work together for peace.

Blessed are You, God, who grants us life, sustains us and enables us to work for a better tomorrow. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. McNULTY. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 346, nays 47, answered “present” 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—346

Abercrombie	Cardoza	Forbes	Kaptur	Moran (KS)	Ryan (KS)
Ackerman	Carson (IN)	Frank (MA)	Keller	Moran (VA)	Sánchez, Linda
Aderholt	Carter	Franks (AZ)	Kelly	Murphy	T.
Akin	Case	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (RI)	Musgrave	Sanchez, Loretta
Alexander	Castle	Frost	Kildee	Myrick	Sanders
Allen	Chabot	Gallegly	Kilpatrick	Nadler	Saxton
Andrews	Chandler	Garrett (NJ)	Kind	Napolitano	Schiff
Baca	Chocola	Gephardt	King (IA)	Neal (MA)	Schrock
Bachus	Clay	Gibbons	King (NY)	Nethercutt	Scott (GA)
Baker	Clyburn	Gilchrest	Kirk	Neugebauer	Scott (VA)
Ballenger	Coble	Gillmor	Kleczka	Ney	Sensenbrenner
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Gingrey	Kline	Northup	Serrano
Barton (TX)	Collins	Gonzalez	Knollenberg	Norwood	Sessions
Bass	Cox	Goode	Kolbe	Nunes	Shadegg
Beauprez	Cramer	Goodlatte	LaHood	Nussle	Shaw
Becerra	Crenshaw	Gordon	Langevin	Oberstar	Shays
Bereuter	Crowley	Goss	Lantos	Obey	Sherman
Berkley	Cubin	Granger	Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Sherwood
Berman	Culberson	Green (WI)	Latham	Osborne	Shimkus
Berry	Cunningham	Greenwood	LaTourette	Ose	Shuster
Biggert	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez	Leach	Owens	Simmons
Billirakis	Davis (CA)	Hall	Lee	Oxley	Simpson
Bishop (GA)	Davis (FL)	Harman	Levin	Pallone	Skelton
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Harris	Lewis (CA)	Pascrell	Smith (NJ)
Bishop (UT)	Davis (TN)	Hastings (WA)	Lewis (GA)	Paul	Smith (TX)
Blackburn	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes	Lewis (KY)	Payne	Smith (WA)
Blumenauer	Davis, Tom	Hayworth	Linder	Pearce	Snyder
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Hensarling	Lipinski	Pelosi	Solis
Boehner	DeLauro	Hill	Lofgren	Pence	Souder
Bonilla	DeLay	Hinojosa	Lowey	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson	Lucas (KY)	Petri	Stark
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoeffel	Lucas (OK)	Pickering	Stearns
Boozman	Dicks	Hoekstra	Majette	Pitts	Stenholm
Boswell	Dingell	Holden	Maloney	Platts	Sullivan
Boucher	Doggett	Holt	Manzullo	Pombo	Sweeney
Boyd	Dooley (CA)	Honda	Markey	Pomeroy	Tanner
Bradley (NH)	Doolittle	Hostettler	Marshall	Porter	Tauscher
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Houghton	Matheson	Portman	Taylor (NC)
Brown (OH)	Dreier	Hoyer	Matsui	Price (NC)	Terry
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Hyde	McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)	Tiahrt
Brown, Corrine	Dunn	Inslee	McCarthy (NY)	Putnam	Tiberi
Brown-Waite,	Edwards	Isakson	McCollum	Quinn	Tierney
Ginny	Ehlers	Israel	McCotter	Radanovich	Toomey
Burgess	Emanuel	Issa	McCrery	Rahall	Towns
Burns	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)	McGovern	Rangel	Turner (OH)
Burr	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee	McHugh	Regula	Turner (TX)
Buyer	Evans	(TX)	McInnis	Rehberg	Upton
Calvert	Everett	Jenkins	McIntyre	Renzi	Van Hollen
Camp	Farr	John	McKeon	Reyes	Vitter
Cannon	Fattah	Johnson (CT)	Meek (FL)	Reynolds	Walden (OR)
Cantor	Feeney	Johnson (IL)	Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Walsh
Capito	Ferguson	Jones (NC)	Menendez	Rogers (AL)	Wamp
Capps	Flake	Jones (OH)	Mica	Rogers (KY)	Watson
Cardin	Foley	Kanjorski	Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Watt
			Millender-	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
			McDonald	Rothman	Whitfield
			Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
			Miller (MI)	Royce	Wilson (SC)
			Miller (NC)	Ruppersberger	Wolf
			Miller, Gary	Rush	Woolsey
			Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Wynn
			Moore	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3721

NAYS—47

Baird	Hooley (OR)	Sabo
Baldwin	Hulshof	Sandlin
Bell	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kennedy (MN)	Strickland
Costello	Kucinich	Stupak
DeFazio	Lampson	Taylor (MS)
English	Larsen (WA)	Thompson (CA)
Filner	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
Ford	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Graves	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Green (TX)	Miller, George	Visclosky
Gutknecht	Olver	Waters
Hart	Otter	Weller
Hastings (FL)	Pastor	Wicker
Hefley	Peterson (MN)	Wu
Hinchee	Ramstad	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—39

Ballance	Deutsch	Murtha
Bartlett (MD)	Emerson	Rohrabacher
Boehler	Engel	Slaughter
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Smith (MI)
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Tauzin
Capuano	Grijalva	Thomas
Carson (OK)	Herger	Thornberry
Conyers	Hunter	Velázquez
Crane	Istook	Weiner
Cummings	Jefferson	Weldon (FL)
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Weldon (PA)
Delahunt	Kingston	Wexler
DeMint	Lynch	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1028

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, June 2, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from The Honorable Chris Nelson, Secretary of State, State of South Dakota, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special election held June 1, 2004, the Honorable Stephanie Herseeth was elected Representative in congress for the At Large Congressional District, State of South Dakota.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL.

Attachment.

SECRETARY OF STATE, Pierre, SD, June 2, 2004.

Hon. JEFF TRANDAHL, Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. TRANDAHL: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on June 1, 2004 for Representative in Congress from the At-Large Congressional District of South Dakota show that Stephanie Herseeth received 132,236 votes or 50.6% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Stephanie Herseeth was elected as Representative in Congress from the At-Large Congressional District of South Dakota.

To the best of my knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official state canvass has been conducted on June 8, an official certification of election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

CHRIS NELSON.

SOUTH DAKOTA CENTRAL ELECTION REPORTING SYSTEM STATE TOTALS—JUNE 1, 2004

[Statewide: Precincts reported: 798; precincts to report: 798]

Name	Party	Votes	Pct.
Dem. Presidential:			
Howard Dean	D	4,837	.06
John Kerry	D	69,454	.82
Dennis Kucinich	D	2,043	.02
Lyndon Larouche	D	2,942	.03
Uncommitted delegates	D	5,104	.06
U.S. House:			
Larry Diehrich	R	129,292	.49
Stephanie Herseeth	D	132,236	.51

PROVIDING FOR SWEARING IN OF MS. STEPHANIE HERSEETH, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. STEPHANIE HERSEETH) be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE STEPHANIE HERSEETH, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from South Dakota (Ms. HERSEETH) come forward and raise her right hand.

Ms. HERSEETH appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will

and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are a Member of the House of Representatives.

□ 1030

INTRODUCTION OF REPRESENTATIVE STEPHANIE HERSEETH

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, it is the custom of the House when a new Member is sworn in after a special election, the senior Member from that Member's State has the privilege of introducing the new Member to the House. Since South Dakota only has one Member of Congress, that is not possible today; and so I have that privilege.

But I do want to acknowledge the escort committee to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSEETH), and that does have a nice ring to it, and what a distinguished escort committee it is, indeed: our former colleague, the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, TOM DASCHLE, and another former colleague from the House of Representatives, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Tim Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSEETH) will bring to this House of Representatives the values of the heartland of America and a voice for her generation. She comes from a very distinguished political family in South Dakota. Her grandfather was Governor; her parents were public servants, very respected in South Dakota. She comes here, though, to make her own mark and to make the people of South Dakota very, very proud.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to recognize the distinguished gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSEETH).

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE AND THANKS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE AS REPRESENTATIVE FROM SOUTH DAKOTA

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

Ms. HERSEETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my fellow Members of the United States House of Representatives for that gracious and warm welcome. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for that very kind and generous introduction. I thank Senators DASCHLE and JOHNSON for taking the time to be here with me and my family today. I also thank another native South Dakotan, Jeff Trandahl, our Clerk here in the House, for all of his work and the work of his office. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to be sworn in at the earliest opportunity so that the people of

South Dakota can once again have their voice in this great Chamber.

I would also like to thank our Secretary of State in South Dakota, Chris Nelson, who certified the election with great speed so that the interest of our State could be represented in this distinguished body. I would also like to say a grateful thank you to the staff of former Congressman Bill Janklow, who have continued to serve these past several months and have been true to the welcoming spirit of South Dakota.

There are too many to thank for this great honor: my grandparents, especially my Grampa Ralph Stiles, who is here with me today, who gave me his unconditional love and support; my parents, the strongest people I know who taught me to reach across disagreements and work for a common good; and the people of South Dakota, to whom I pledge that I will do everything I can to represent them honorably and to always do what is best for our entire State.

And lastly, while the months and years ahead are filled with great possibilities, the unsettling truth is that my standing here today was born from a tragedy. The opportunity for me to represent my State would not have happened if not for the heartache suffered by many. That reminder will be with me always.

But from great sorrow can come new beginnings for my State at this time in our Nation's history, for all of us as a people. I am humbled by this moment and by the trust and responsibility that South Dakota has placed in me. I will do my best, and I will always remember why I am here.

In the language of the Lakota people, "pilamaya," thank you, and may God bless this great House of the people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(c) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), the whole number of the House is adjusted to 435.

□ 1045

WELCOMING RABBI JOUI HESSEL, WASHINGTON HEBREW CONGREGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to welcome a special guest to our House from Miami, Florida, who shared her message of prayer and inspiration with us today, Rabbi Joui Hessel. We are happy to have the Rabbi and her wonderful family, who reside in my congressional district in Miami, Florida, with us here today.

Rabbi Hessel was ordained from the Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute

of Religion in New York in 2001. While in Rabbinical School in New York, she served several congregations and also served as the Education Intern at Leo Bacck Temple in Los Angeles, California.

Rabbi Hessel is currently serving at the Washington Hebrew Congregation right here in Washington, D.C., as associate Rabbi. She has been in that capacity since June of 2001 and is active in many programs, including youth activities and adult education. The Rabbi is currently working on an educational article for a book on Parenting Young Adult Children.

Thank you, Rabbi Joui Hessel, for your spiritual leadership and for your prayers and for having such wonderful parents, who are my constituents.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1721. An act to amend the Indian Land Consolidation Act to improve provisions relating to probate of trust and restricted land, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair will entertain 10 1-minute speeches per side.

NEW PRESCRIPTION DRUG CARD REDUCES COSTS FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, effective June 1, each senior on Medicare who would like one could get a Medicare prescription drug discount card. This card will be good for about a 20 percent discount in most local pharmacies.

What the senior could do is dial 1-800-Medicare or go to WWW.MEDICARE.GOV and find out which of the local drugstores has the best deal on Lipitor or Glucophage or whatever he or she uses on a regular basis, and then, if it works, if it is a good idea, invest anywhere from \$20 to \$30, in that neighborhood, and choose which card is the best and start enjoying a 20 percent discount.

This is a program that precedes the 2006 voluntary program which was signed by President Bush, passed by this House and the Senate and endorsed by the AARP to give seniors on Medicare a prescription drug benefit.

It is a voluntary program, it reduces drug costs by about 50 percent, and it is something that we did not have in Medicare as an option before. It is a very good program, and I invite seniors to call 1-800 Medicare and take a look at it.

OPPOSING OUTSOURCING OF JOBS

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, my constituents write each week telling me about jobs that are being outsourced, asking me what is Congress doing about it. They are amazed and they are outraged that our President can support this policy, when over 1 million Californians are out of work.

I understand their concerns, especially when the Bush administration recently awarded a massive \$10 billion government contract to Accenture, a company incorporated in Bermuda, when two American-based companies actually bid for the contract. They also know that the President used outsourced workers in India to make phone calls for his Presidential campaign. All of this, Mr. Speaker, when 8.4 million people are out of work nationwide.

Outsourcing is bad economic policy, and I urge the House leadership to address this issue immediately.

TRANSITION TO IRAQI SELF-GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, to the new prime minister of Iraq, Dr. Ayad Allawi, let me say you are most welcome, sir. Dr. Allawi, in addition to being selected as the new prime minister for the country of Iraq, provided a very vociferous "thank you" to President Bush and the United States of America for ridding his country of the scourge of Saddam Hussein.

We have now seen two significant events this year, the standing up of the new Iraqi constitution, a constitution that respects majority rule but also respects the rights of the minority; a constitution that contains a robust bill of rights and the protection and the involvement of women in government. There is a clear goal understood by all who are involved in that process, to see the Iraqi people free and in charge of Iraq for the first time in generations.

America's task in Iraq is not only to defeat an enemy. It is to give strength to a friend, a free, representative government that serves the people and fights on their behalf. The sooner this goal is achieved, the sooner our job will be done.

The Iraqi interim government takes power on 30 June. It will serve for only 7 months until a new government is chosen through democratic elections to be held as soon as possible, but no later than the end of January, 2005.

AMERICANS DESIRE CHANGE OF DIRECTION

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, that old question remains relevant: Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?

Under this Republican Congress and the Bush administration, there is no doubt that people in Silicone Valley are not better off. At home, one in three households has had a layoff since Bush took office. In January, 2001, the unemployment rate in San Jose was 1.6 percent. In April of this year, it was 6.2 percent.

Across the country, the average length of unemployment is the highest in 20 years. The overall job picture is the worst in nearly 40 years.

The truth is, House Republicans do not have a real plan. Instead, they are launching a public relations offensive ironically titled Hire Our Workers, HOW.

Yes, Americans want to know "how" Republicans can explain the loss of 2.2 million American jobs. "How" can Republicans think today's sham job training bill will help the 443,000 Californians who were laid off just last month?

Democrats have a proven track record of creating 22 million jobs in the nineties. Now Americans want a change in direction, not more votes on the same tired, gimmick proposals.

IBM WORKING TOWARD LIFELONG LEARNING

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, lifelong learning is very important to the competitiveness of this country. I would like to highlight what IBM, a company with a very strong presence in my district, is doing for lifelong learning.

When I visited IBM's Austin site recently, I learned about several programs that IBM has which promote science and math for children. The company's Young Explorer is an interactive apparatus that young children have to access many of the schools in districts around the country. It targets kids up to age 8. By making science and math fun, IBM hopes that these children will decide to go into areas of science and math.

IBM also runs the Excite Science Camp For Girls at 38 U.S. sites during the summer months. Such camps give seventh and eighth grade girls the opportunity to meet with IBM female engineers, design and build their own Web sites, and hopefully come to realize that engineering is a viable career option for them.

IBM has collaborative relationships with many colleges and universities. The company and students share resources and work together on research and development endeavors. The company also goes into the community and offers computer training.

IBM has the right idea. We need to create initiatives for U.S. employees to build new skills in today's global economy. If we do not, U.S. workers will get left behind.

EX-FELON VOTING RIGHTS BILL

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

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that we have celebrated for veterans during the Memorial Day weekend in a very proper and respectful way.

Last evening, I introduced legislation that would correct an inequity for our veterans. Many would be surprised to learn that veterans who have served honorably in the United States military who have been discharged honorably, who subsequently, because of posttraumatic stress disorder, find themselves within the walls of prisons on a felony conviction, when they are released after they have served their time, Mr. Speaker, many of them in certain States are denied the right to vote.

Disenfranchisement of those who jeopardized their lives in our defense of democratic ideas is an offense to the conscience of our Nation. Denying veterans who committed a crime and served their sentences the right to vote is unconscionable.

This bill would give liberty and justice for all people, Mr. Speaker, especially for our veterans. I would encourage every Member of the House who respects and loves and honors the veterans of this Nation to sign on as a sponsor of this legislation.

PUTTING PROFIT BEFORE PATRIOTISM MUST END

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, time and again companies like Accenture have abused loopholes in the Tax Code to shirk their duties to the United States. They incorporate on paper in countries like Bermuda for the express purpose of avoiding U.S. taxes. There is no justification in today's world for this shameful practice, none.

Accenture also outsources jobs. Now we learn that the Department of Homeland Security has given Accenture a record \$10 billion contract, I assume with the blessing of this majority, which has done everything in its power to allow this practice to continue, including watering down a provision that I authored to prohibit these companies from contracting with the Department of Homeland Security. I remind my colleagues that this House passed that provision by a vote of 318 to 110, with the other body following suit.

So when I hear some actually defend this practice, I think, tell that to the

families of those men and women who have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. Tell them that their loved ones gave their lives defending the right of multinational corporations to cheat the American taxpayer, because that is what they are doing.

The time for putting profit before patriotism has passed. That is what these folks are doing. Rewarding companies who have abandoned our country with government contracts, as this administration is continuing to do, is not only unpatriotic, it is immoral. It should end.

SENIORS OF AMERICA DESERVE BETTER PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the seniors of America deserve better. This Republican House and Republican Senate, as well as the President, have passed a Medicare bill at 3 in the morning that is a sham on seniors.

Our seniors need and want lower prescription prices. This bill did nothing to lower prices. Medicare negotiates for lower prices for the bulk of the 40 million Americans who need assistance. This bill does not allow our seniors to go to Canada, where medicines cost two-thirds less than what they are in America.

Finally, there is the discount card that is not a discount. Seniors, if you have a discount from a pension plan from yourself or your husband, it is going to be better than this one. Use it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sham on our seniors. Our seniors deserve more. They built our country. Let us do better. Help them get their medicines. They need them to survive.

RECOUPING MONEY STOLEN BY ENRON

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, it is high time for the Bush administration to take action to recoup the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Enron energy trading racket stole from people in the State of Washington.

We have now heard the tapes, the smoking guns, where energy traders talk about "jamming" grandmothers in Washington State, saying "burn, baby, burn," during the brownouts, just laughing at the fact that they got away with hundreds of millions of dollars of theft.

We are calling on the administration to stop protecting the Enron energy trading racket. We will offer on the floor of the House next week an amendment to compel the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to get off the dime and get our money back from Enron.

This is a ripoff that is too obvious even for the Bush administration to ignore, and it is time for Congress to stand up on our hind legs and force this administration to take action. The people in Snohomish County deserve their hundreds of millions of dollars back, and we are going to see to it that they get it.

AARP AND THE DRUG BILL

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, AARP owes every senior an explanation. Its leader trumpeted a Republican prescription drug bill passed in the dead of night last year. It would have been dead on arrival if the administration had told the truth, but they did not.

But the seniors, including my 94-year-old mother, are really smart. So AARP, when they sent out 26,000 packets of information, only 400 signed up.

My mother and her buddies are pretty darn smart. They know the difference between a real deal and a raw deal. The administration gave seniors a raw deal, and AARP leadership helped.

Senator KERRY will give seniors a real deal with real benefits for prescription drugs.

□ 1100

Democrats are ready to do what is right, beginning with telling the truth.

It is time AARP repudiated the reckless endorsement of a Republican bill that is bad medicine for seniors. It is time for AARP to take the medicine every mother teaches her child: tell the truth and take responsibility when you do something stupid.

BUSH TAX CUTS CAUSE LARGEST DEFICIT IN NATION'S HISTORY

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Arkansas, nearly 75,000 people are out of work today. Unemployment has increased by 19 percent in the last 3½ years.

However, our Nation's Treasury Secretary John Snow is visiting Arkansas today to talk about how President Bush's tax policy reforms are actually creating jobs in Arkansas. All the President's tax cuts for the wealthy have given us is the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history, tax cuts that our children will be forced to pay.

For Secretary Snow to come to Arkansas today and tell Arkansans the administration's economic plan is creating jobs shows a blatant disregard for what Arkansas families are really facing. Working families do not need more rhetoric; they need jobs, they need affordable health care, they need a real Medicare prescription drug plan and,

yes, they need lower gasoline prices, all things this administration has failed to do.

ALLOWING SENIORS ACCESS TO DRUG REIMPORTATION

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the new drug discount card is nothing more than the old bait and switch. The Republican leadership continues to try to trick our seniors into thinking they are getting a Medicare prescription drug benefit, while in reality offering nothing more than an 18-month sham program that fails to offer any significant savings to seniors. Not surprisingly, this temporary program prioritizes the pharmaceutical companies' profit over the health care expenses of our Nation's seniors.

While the administration has claimed that these cards will have savings ranging from 10 percent to 25 percent, there is no guarantee of this; and there is absolutely no control over the prices charged.

Additionally, the drug companies determine what drugs to discount and how much seniors pay. And while seniors are locked into a drug card for a full year, the drug companies are at liberty to change what discounts they offer from week to week. As a matter of fact, some have already changed their drug prices so that it does not cut into their bottom line.

The truth is that a better solution with real benefits is available. With drug costs increasing at 3.5 times the rate of inflation, we owe it to our Nation's seniors to finally allow them access to drug reimportation.

It is time to do the right thing and offer real savings to our seniors. We cannot afford not to do so.

2006 BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned from an internal Bush administration budget memo detailing their planned cuts.

According to the budget document, education, transportation, Social Security, the Environmental Protection Agency, National Science Foundation, and the Small Business Administration are all in line for drastic cuts in their budgets. Head Start, for example, a \$177 million cut. The National Institutes of Health would be slashed by more than \$600 million. The administration is planning cuts for 2006; and all the while, they are asking for an additional \$25 billion to rebuild and secure Iraq. The additional \$25 billion for Iraq is on top of the \$165 billion the American taxpayers have already allocated and paid.

These reconstruction funds are building schools, roads, and encouraging business development in Iraq; and all the while, we are making corresponding cuts here at home. I understand that we need to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan, but not at the expense of what we do here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when President Bush in 2000 declared his opposition to nation-building, who knew it was America he was talking about.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INFORMING SENIORS ABOUT MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, as many know, for deeply held philosophical reasons, I opposed the creation of a prescription drug entitlement in Medicare. But I never opposed helping low-income seniors or using the private sector to give seniors more buying power to save money on their prescription drugs, which is exactly what became available this week with the new Medicare drug discount card and the \$600 credit for low-income seniors. In fact, I hosted five Medicare discount drug fairs across my district, speaking to more than 1,000 of my constituents.

While many have made speeches on this floor and across the country creating anxiety about this new bill, I found it instructive to spend time with seniors. Despite my opposition to a drug entitlement, I felt I had a moral obligation to explain to seniors, particularly low-income seniors, what is available as of this week in the new Medicare drug discount card benefit.

I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of your view of this legislation, to view what is available in this law and to discharge your duty to your constituents to make knowledge available of the new drug discount card and the low-income assistance for seniors.

BACK TO WORK INCENTIVE ACT OF 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 656, I call up the bill (H.R. 444) to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish a Personal Reemployment Accounts grant program to assist Americans in returning to work, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 444 is as follows:

H.R. 444

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 "Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO SUPPORT PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.

Subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.) is amended by inserting after chapter 5 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 5A—PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS**“SEC. 135A. PURPOSES.**

“The purposes of this chapter are to provide for the establishment of personal reemployment accounts for certain individuals identified as likely to exhaust their unemployment compensation in order to—

“(1) accelerate the reemployment of such individuals;

“(2) promote the retention in employment of such individuals; and

“(3) provide such individuals with enhanced flexibility, choice, and control in obtaining intensive reemployment, training, and supportive services.

“SEC. 135B. DEFINITION.

“In this chapter, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands.

“SEC. 135C. GRANTS TO STATES.

“(a) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) reserve $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under section 137(d) for use under section 135I; and

“(2) use the remainder of the amount appropriated under section 137(d) to make allotments in accordance with subsection (b).

“(b) ALLOTMENT AMONG STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amount made available under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount that is proportionate to the relative number of unemployed individuals in the State as compared to the total number of unemployed individuals in all States in order to provide assistance for eligible individuals in accordance with this chapter.

“(2) SMALL STATE MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) each State (other than the United States Virgin Islands) shall receive an allotment under paragraph (1) that is not less than $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 percent of the amount made available under subsection (a)(2) for the fiscal year; and

“(B) the United States Virgin Islands shall receive an allotment under paragraph (1) that is not less than $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent of the amount made available under subsection (a)(2) for the fiscal year.

“(c) AVAILABILITY.—Notwithstanding section 189(g)(1), amounts made available under subsection (a) to carry out this chapter shall be available for obligation and expenditure beginning on the date of the enactment of the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003.

“SEC. 135D. WITHIN STATE ALLOCATION.

“(a) ALLOCATION.—Of the amount allotted to a State under section 135C—

“(1) not more than 2 percent of the amount may be reserved by the Governor of the State to enhance the system of worker profiling described in section 303(j) of the Social Security Act and to establish and operate a data management system, as necessary, and carry out other appropriate activities to implement this chapter;

“(2) 5 percent of the amount shall be allocated by the State to local areas in accordance with the formula described in subsection (b) for start-up costs and other operating costs related to the provision of assistance under this chapter; and

“(3) the remainder of the amount shall be provided to local areas for the establishment of personal reemployment accounts described in section 135E for eligible individuals in such local areas.

“(b) FORMULA.—A State shall allocate funds to local areas in the State under subsection (a)(2) in an amount that is proportionate to the relative number of unemployed individuals in the local area as compared to the total number of unemployed individuals in the State.

“(c) AVAILABILITY.—Notwithstanding section 189(g)(2), amounts allotted to a State under section 135C, and amounts subsequently provided to a local area under this section, shall be available for obligation and expenditure only for the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003.

“SEC. 135E. PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.

“(a) ACCOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds provided to a local area under section 135D shall be used to provide eligible individuals with personal reemployment accounts to be used in accordance with section 135F. An eligible individual may receive only one personal reemployment account.

“(2) AMOUNT.—The State shall establish the amount of a personal reemployment account, which shall be uniform throughout the State, and shall not exceed \$3,000.

“(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall establish eligibility criteria for individuals for personal reemployment accounts in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an individual shall be eligible to receive assistance under this chapter if, beginning after the date of enactment of the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003, the individual—

“(i) is identified by the State pursuant to section 303(j)(1) of the Social Security Act as likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and in need of job search assistance to make a successful transition to new employment;

“(ii) is receiving regular unemployment compensation under any State or Federal unemployment compensation program administered by the State; and

“(iii) is eligible for not less than 20 weeks for the regular unemployment compensation described in clause (ii).

“(B) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY AND PRIORITY CRITERIA.—A State may establish criteria that is in addition to the criteria described in subparagraph (A) for the eligibility of individuals to receive assistance under this chapter. A State may also establish criteria for priority in the provision of assistance to such eligible individuals under this chapter.

“(3) TRANSITION RULE.—

“(A) PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS LIKELY TO EXHAUST UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—At the option of the State, and subject to clause (ii), an individual may be eligible to receive assistance under this chapter if the individual—

“(I) during the 90-day period ending on the date of the enactment of the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003, was identified by the State pursuant to section 303(j)(1) of the Social Security Act as likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and in need of job search assistance to make a successful transition to new employment; and

“(II) otherwise meets the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (2)(A).

“(ii) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY AND PRIORITY CRITERIA.—A State may establish criteria that is in addition to the criteria described in clause (i) for the eligibility of individuals to receive assistance under this chapter. A State may also establish criteria for priority in the provision of assistance to such eligible individuals under this chapter.

“(B) PREVIOUSLY EXHAUSTED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—At the option of the State, an individual may be eligible to receive assistance under this chapter if the individual—

“(i) during the 90-day period ending on the date of the enactment of the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003, exhausted all rights to any unemployment compensation; and

“(ii) (I) is enrolled in training and needs additional support to complete such training, with a priority of service to be provided to such individuals who are training for shortage occupations or high-growth industries; or

“(II) is separated from employment in an industry or occupation that has experienced declining employment, or no longer provides any employment, in the local labor market during the two-year period ending on the date of the determination of eligibility of the individual under this subparagraph.

“(4) NO INDIVIDUAL ENTITLEMENT.—Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to entitle any individual to receive a personal reemployment account.

“(c) LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) INFORMATION AND ATTESTATION.—Prior to the establishment of a personal reemployment account for an eligible individual under this chapter, the one-stop delivery system shall ensure that the individual—

“(A) is informed of the requirements applicable to the personal reemployment account, including the allowable uses of funds from the account, the limitations on access to services described under section 135F(a)(3)(C) and a description of such services, and the conditions for receiving a reemployment bonus;

“(B) has the option to develop a personal reemployment plan which will identify the employment goals and appropriate combination of services selected by the individual to achieve the employment goals; and

“(C) signs an attestation that the individual will comply with the requirements relating to the personal reemployment accounts under this chapter and will reimburse the account or, if the account has been terminated, the program under this chapter, for any amounts expended from the account that are not allowable.

“(2) PERIODIC INTERVIEWS.—If a recipient exhausts his or her rights to any unemployment compensation, and the recipient has a remaining balance in his or her personal reemployment account, the one-stop delivery system shall conduct periodic interviews with the recipient to assist the recipient in meeting his or her individual employment goals.

“SEC. 135F. USE OF FUNDS.

“(a) ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3), a recipient may use amounts in a personal reemployment account to purchase one or more of the following:

“(A) Intensive services, including those types of services specified in section 134(d)(3)(C).

“(B) Training services, including those types of services specified in section 134(d)(4)(D).

“(C) Supportive services, except for needs-related payments.

“(D) Assistance to purchase or lease an automobile, if such assistance is necessary to allow the recipient to accept a bona fide offer of employment for which there is a reasonable expectation of long-term duration.

“(2) DELIVERY OF SERVICES.—The following requirements relating to delivery of services shall apply to the program under this chapter:

“(A) Recipients may use funds from the personal reemployment account to purchase

the services described in paragraph (1) through the one-stop delivery system on a fee-for-service basis, or through other providers, consistent with safeguards described in the State plan under section 135G.

“(B) The one-stop delivery system may pay costs for such services directly on behalf of the recipient, through a voucher system, or by reimbursement to the recipient upon receipt of appropriate cost documentation, consistent with safeguards described in the State plan under section 135G.

“(C) Each one-stop delivery system shall make available to recipients information on training providers specified in section 134(d)(4)(F)(ii), information available to the one-stop delivery system on providers of the intensive and supportive services described in paragraph (1), and information relating to occupations in demand in the local area.

“(3) LIMITATIONS.—The following limitations shall apply with respect to personal reemployment accounts under this chapter:

“(A)(i) Amounts in a personal reemployment account may be used for up to one year from the date of the establishment of the account.

“(ii) No personal reemployment account may be established beginning 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003.

“(B) Each recipient shall submit cost documentation as required by the one-stop delivery system.

“(C) For the 1-year period following the establishment of the account, recipients may not receive intensive, supportive, or training services funded under this title except on a fee-for-services basis as specified in paragraph (2)(A).

“(D) Amounts in a personal reemployment account shall be nontransferable.

“(b) INCOME SUPPORT.—A State may authorize recipients determined eligible under section 135E(b)(3)(B) to withdraw amounts from the personal reemployment account on a weekly basis for purposes of income support in amounts up to the average weekly amount of unemployment compensation that the individual received prior to his or her exhaustion of rights to unemployment compensation if the individual is engaged in job search, intensive services, or training that is expected to lead to employment.

“(c) REEMPLOYMENT BONUS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2)—

“(A) if a recipient determined eligible under section 135E(b)(2) obtains full-time employment before the end of the 13th week of unemployment for which unemployment compensation is paid, the balance of his or her personal reemployment account shall be provided directly to the recipient in cash; and

“(B) if a recipient determined eligible under section 135E(b)(3) obtains full-time employment before the end of the 13th week after the date on which the account is established, the balance of his or her personal reemployment account shall be provided directly to the recipient in cash.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—The following limitations shall apply with respect to a recipient described in paragraph (1):

“(A) 60 percent of the remaining personal reemployment account balance shall be paid to the recipient at the time of reemployment.

“(B) 40 percent of the remaining personal reemployment account balance shall be paid to the recipient not later than 6 months after the date of reemployment.

“(3) EXCEPTION REGARDING SUBSEQUENT UNEMPLOYMENT.—If a recipient described in paragraph (1) subsequently becomes unemployed due to a lack of work after receiving the portion of the reemployment bonus spec-

ified under paragraph (2)(A), the individual may use the amount remaining in the personal reemployment account for the purposes described in subsection (a) but may not be eligible for additional cash payments under this subsection.

“SEC. 135G. STATE PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order for a State to receive an allotment under section 135C, the Governor of the State shall submit to the Secretary a plan that includes a description of how the State intends to carry out the personal reemployment accounts authorized under this chapter, including—

“(1) the criteria and methods to be used for determining eligibility for the personal reemployment accounts, including whether the State intends to include the optional categories described in section 135E(b)(3), and the additional criteria and priority for service that the State intends to apply, if any, pursuant to section 135E(b)(2)(B);

“(2) the methods or procedures, developed in consultation with local boards and chief elected officials, to be used to provide eligible individuals information relating to services and providers, and safeguards, developed in consultation with such boards and officials, to ensure that funds from the personal reemployment accounts are used for purposes authorized under this chapter and are not used for services or providers that are wholly unreasonable or egregious;

“(3) how the State will coordinate the activities carried out under this chapter with the employment and training activities carried out under section 134 and other activities carried out through the one-stop delivery system in the State.

“(b) PLAN SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL.—A State plan submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a) by a Governor shall be considered to be approved by the Secretary at the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the Secretary receives the plan, unless the Secretary makes a written determination during such period that the plan is incomplete or otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter.

“SEC. 135H. PROGRAM INFORMATION.

“The Secretary may require from States the collection and reporting on such financial, performance, and other program-related information as the Secretary determines is appropriate to carry out this chapter, including the evaluation described in section 135I.

“SEC. 135I. EVALUATION.

“(a) EVALUATION.—From the amount made available under section 135C(a)(1), the Secretary, pursuant to the authority provided under section 172, shall, directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with appropriate entities, conduct an evaluation of the activities carried out under this chapter.

“(b) CONDUCT OF EVALUATION.—The evaluation shall examine the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the purposes described in section 135A and such other purposes as the Secretary determines are appropriate.

“(c) REPORT.—The report to Congress under section 172(e) relating to the results of the evaluations required under section 172 shall include the recommendation of the Secretary with respect to the use of personal reemployment accounts as a mechanism to assist individuals in obtaining and retaining employment.”

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION.

Section 117(d) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(B)(i)(I), by striking “sections 128 and 133” and inserting “sections 128, 133, and 135D”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, activities authorized under section 135F” after “section 134”.

SEC. 4. DELIVERY OF SERVICES.

Section 134(c)(1) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) shall provide access to personal reemployment accounts in accordance to section 135E.”

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.

Section 137 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2872) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 to carry out chapter 5A.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under paragraph (1) to carry out section 135I are authorized to remain available until expended.”

SEC. 6. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

The table of contents for the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 is amended by inserting after the items relating to chapter 5 of subtitle B of title I the following new items:

“CHAPTER 5A—PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS

“Sec. 135A. Purposes.

“Sec. 135B. Definitions.

“Sec. 135C. Grants to States.

“Sec. 135D. Within State allocation.

“Sec. 135E. Personal reemployment accounts.

“Sec. 135F. Use of funds.

“Sec. 135G. State plan.

“Sec. 135H. Program information.

“Sec. 135I. Evaluation, technical assistance, and data collection activities.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 4444 is adopted.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 4444 is as follows:

H.R. 4444

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 “Worker Reemployment Accounts Act of 2004”.

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO SUPPORT PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.

Section 171 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands.

“(2) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—In addition to the demonstration projects under subsection (b), the Secretary may establish and implement a national demonstration project designed to analyze and provide data on workforce training programs that accelerate the reemployment of unemployed individuals, promote the retention in employment of such individuals, and provide such individuals with enhanced flexibility, choice, and control in obtaining intensive reemployment, training, and supportive services.

“(3) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the demonstration project, the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to provide personal reemployment accounts to eligible individuals. In awarding grants under this subsection the Secretary shall take into consideration awarding grants to eligible entities from diverse geographic areas, including rural areas.

“(B) DURATION.—The Secretary shall make the grants for periods of not less than 2 years and may renew the grant for each of the succeeding 3 years.

“(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State; or

“(B) a local board or consortium of local boards.

“(5) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall use the grant funds to provide, through a local area or areas, eligible individuals with personal reemployment accounts. An eligible individual may receive only 1 personal reemployment account.

“(B) GEOGRAPHIC AREA AND AMOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The eligible entity shall establish the amount of a personal reemployment account for each eligible individual participating, which shall be uniform throughout the area represented by the eligible entity, and shall not exceed \$3,000.

“(ii) OPTION FOR STATES.—If the eligible entity is a State, the eligible entity may choose to use the grant statewide, if practicable, or only in specified local areas within a State.

“(C) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity shall establish eligibility criteria for individuals for personal reemployment accounts in accordance with this subparagraph.

“(ii) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA REQUIREMENTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), an individual shall be eligible to receive a personal reemployment account under a grant awarded under this subsection if, beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the individual—

“(aa) is identified by the State pursuant to section 303(j)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(j)(1)) as likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and in need of job search assistance to make a successful transition to new employment, or the individual’s unemployment can be attributed in substantial part to unfair competition from Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated;

“(bb) is receiving regular unemployment compensation under any Federal or State unemployment compensation program administered by the State; and

“(cc) is eligible for not less than 20 weeks of regular unemployment compensation described in item (bb).

“(II) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY AND PRIORITY CRITERIA.—An eligible entity may establish criteria that are in addition to the criteria described in subclause (I) for the eligibility of individuals to receive a personal reemployment account under this subsection. An eligible entity may also establish criteria for priority in the provision of a personal reemployment account to such eligible individuals under a grant awarded under this subsection.

“(iii) TRANSITION RULE.—

“(I) PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS LIKELY TO EXHAUST UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—At the option of the eligible entity, and subject to item (bb), an individual may be eligible to receive a personal reemployment account under this subsection if the individual—

“(AA) during the 13-week period ending the week prior to the date of the enactment of

the subsection, was identified by the State pursuant to section 303(j)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(j)(1)) as likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and in need of job search assistance to make a successful transition to new employment; and

“(BB) otherwise meets the requirements of clause (ii)(I)(bb) and (cc).

“(bb) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY AND PRIORITY CRITERIA.—An eligible entity may establish criteria that is in addition to the criteria described in item (aa) for the eligibility of individuals to receive a personal reemployment account under this subsection. An eligible entity may also establish criteria for priority in the provision of such accounts to such eligible individuals under this subsection.

“(II) PREVIOUSLY EXHAUSTED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—At the option of the eligible entity, an individual may be eligible to receive a personal reemployment account under a grant awarded under this subsection if the individual—

“(aa) during the 26-week period ending the week prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, exhausted all rights to any unemployment compensation; and

“(bb)(AA) is enrolled in training and needs additional support to complete such training, with a priority of service to be provided to such individuals who are training for shortage occupations or high-growth industries; or

“(BB) is separated from employment in an industry or occupation that has experienced declining employment, or no longer provides any employment, in the local labor market during the 2-year period ending on the date of the determination of eligibility of the individual under this subparagraph.

“(iv) NO INDIVIDUAL ENTITLEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to entitle any individual to receive a personal reemployment account.

“(D) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) INFORMATION AND ATTESTATION.—Prior to the establishment of a personal reemployment account for an eligible individual, the eligible entity receiving a grant, through the one-stop delivery system in the participating local area or areas, shall ensure that the individual—

“(I) is informed of the requirements applicable to the personal reemployment account, including the allowable uses of funds from the account, the limitations on access to services described in paragraph (7)(A)(iii) and a description of such services, and the conditions for receiving a reemployment bonus;

“(II) has the option to develop a personal reemployment plan which will identify the employment goals and appropriate combination of services selected by the individual to achieve the employment goals; and

“(III) signs an attestation that the individual has been given the option to develop a personal reemployment plan in accordance with subclause (II), will comply with the requirements under this subsection relating to the personal reemployment accounts, and will reimburse the account or, if the account has been terminated, the grant awarded under this subsection, for any amounts expended from the account that are not allowable.

“(ii) PERIODIC INTERVIEWS.—If a recipient exhausts his or her rights to any unemployment compensation, and the recipient has a remaining balance in his or her personal reemployment account, the one-stop delivery system shall conduct periodic interviews with the recipient to assist the recipient in meeting his or her individual employment goals.

“(iii) USE OF PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.—The eligible entity receiving a

grant shall ensure that eligible individuals receiving a personal reemployment account use the account in accordance with paragraph (7).

“(6) APPLICATION FOR GRANTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

“(A) if the eligible entity is a State—

“(i) assurance that the application was developed in conjunction with the local board or boards and chief elected officials where the personal reemployment accounts shall be made available; and

“(ii) a description of the methods and procedures for providing funds to local areas where the personal reemployment accounts shall be made available; and

“(B) a description of the criteria and methods to be used for determining eligibility for the personal reemployment account, including whether the eligible entity intends to include the optional categories described in paragraph (5)(C)(iii), and the additional criteria and priority for service that the eligible entity intends to apply, if any, pursuant to paragraph (5)(C)(ii)(II);

“(C) a description of the methods or procedures to be used to provide eligible individuals information relating to services and providers;

“(D) a description of safeguards to ensure that funds from the personal reemployment accounts are used for purposes authorized under this subsection and to ensure the quality and integrity of services and providers, consistent with the purpose of providing eligible individuals with enhanced flexibility, choice, and control in obtaining intensive reemployment, training, and supportive services;

“(E) a description of how the eligible entity will coordinate the activities carried out under this subsection with the employment and training activities carried out under section 134 and other activities carried out by local boards through the one-stop delivery system in the State or local area; and

“(F) an assurance that the eligible entity will comply with any evaluation and reporting requirements the Secretary may require.

“(7) USE OF PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS.—

“(A) ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements contained in clauses (ii) and (iii), a recipient of a personal reemployment account may use amounts in a personal reemployment account to purchase 1 or more of the following:

“(I) Intensive services, including those type of services specified in section 134(d)(3)(C).

“(II) Training services, including those types of services specified in section 134(d)(4)(D).

“(III) Supportive services, except for needs related payments.

“(ii) DELIVERY OF SERVICES.—The following requirements relating to delivery of services shall apply to the grants under this subsection:

“(I) Recipients may use funds from the personal reemployment account to purchase the services described in clause (i) through the one-stop delivery system on a fee-for-service basis, or through other providers, consistent with the safeguards described in paragraph (6)(D).

“(II) The eligible entity, through the one-stop delivery system in the participating local area, may pay costs for such services directly on behalf of the recipient, through a voucher system, or by reimbursement to the recipient upon receipt of appropriate cost documentation.

“(III) Each eligible entity, through the one-stop delivery system in the participating local area, shall make available to recipients information on training providers specified in section 134(d)(4)(F)(ii), information available to the one-stop delivery system on providers of the intensive and supportive services described in clause (i), and information relating to occupations in demand in the local area.

“(iii) LIMITATIONS.—The following limitations shall apply with respect to personal reemployment accounts under this subsection:

“(I) Amounts in a personal reemployment account may be used for up to 1 year from the date of the establishment of the account.

“(II) Each recipient shall submit cost documentation as required by the one-stop delivery system.

“(III) For the 1-year period following the establishment of the account, recipients may not receive intensive, supportive, or training services funded under this title except on a fee-for-services basis as specified in clause (ii)(I).

“(IV) Amounts in a personal reemployment account shall be nontransferable.

“(B) REEMPLOYMENT BONUS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii)—

“(I) if a recipient determined eligible under paragraph (5)(C)(ii) obtains full-time employment before the 13th week of unemployment for which unemployment compensation is paid, the balance of his or her personal reemployment account shall be provided directly to the recipient in cash; and

“(II) if a recipient determined eligible under paragraph (5)(C)(iii) obtains full-time employment before the end of the 13th week after the date on which the account is established, the balance of his or her personal reemployment account shall be provided directly to the recipient in cash.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—The following limitations shall apply with respect to a recipient described in clause (i):

“(I) 60 percent of the remaining personal reemployment account balance shall be paid to the recipient at the time of employment.

“(II) 40 percent of the remaining personal reemployment account shall be paid to the recipient after 26 weeks of employment retention.

“(iii) EXCEPTION REGARDING SUBSEQUENT EMPLOYMENT.—If a recipient described in clause (i) subsequently becomes unemployed due to a lack of work after receiving the portion of the reemployment bonus specified under clause (ii)(I), the individual may use the amount remaining in the personal reemployment account for the purposes described in subparagraph (A) but may not be eligible for additional cash payments under this subparagraph.

“(8) PROGRAM INFORMATION AND EVALUATION.—

“(A) INFORMATION.—The Secretary may require from eligible entities the collection and reporting on such financial, performance, and other program-related information as the Secretary determines is appropriate to carry out this subsection, including the evaluation described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, pursuant to the authority provided under section 172, shall, directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreement with appropriate entities, conduct an evaluation of the activities carried out under any grants awarded under this subsection.

“(ii) REPORT.—The report to Congress under section 172(e) relating to the results of the evaluations required under section 172 shall include the recommendation of the Secretary with respect to the use of personal reemployment account as a mechanism to

assist individuals in obtaining and retaining employment.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and included extraneous material on H.R. 444.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the economic news over the last 8 months has been very encouraging. Republicans and President Bush have focused on creating jobs and opportunity, helping working Americans by providing tax relief, improving worker training and education to help Americans without work get back on their feet, and enhancing the competitiveness of employers both at home and abroad to ensure they continue to hire more and more American workers.

As recent data from the Labor Department shows, the U.S. is creating thousands of new jobs every month. The pro-growth agenda has created 1.1 million net new jobs over the last 8 months, and 625,000 jobs, net new jobs, I should say, in March and April alone. Moreover, the national unemployment rate declined to 5.6 percent in April, lower than the average unemployment rate during the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s.

While this is welcome news for working Americans, we remain committed to ensuring that every displaced worker has the opportunity to find meaningful employment and access to job-training services that will help them find good-paying jobs. As President Bush has said, one worker out of work is one too many, and we have a responsibility to help working families in times when they need it most.

Job training and worker education is more important to this effort in today's changing economy now more than ever before. Every member of our society, including those who are most vulnerable and the hardest to employ, want to achieve independence and self-sufficiency. No American wants endless reliance on our government, and I think the President recognizes that and providing personal reemployment accounts represents one more way we are helping the unemployed by specifically tailoring job training and employment services to meet their unique needs.

Giving displaced workers the resources they need and continuing this economic expansion is critically important. That brings us to why we are here today: to highlight a new and innovative approach to helping the unem-

ployed get back on their feet. The bill before us, the Worker Reemployment Accounts Act, allows demonstration funding under the Workforce Investment Act to be used by States and local workforce investment boards for a pilot project to offer personal reemployment accounts of up to \$3,000.

With the funds from these accounts, unemployed workers may purchase a variety of different services to help them find a new job and to reenter the workforce, including job training, child care, transportation, housing assistance, relocation services, career counseling, computer classes, just to name a few. And all of these are accessible through the One-Stop Career Center system where unemployed workers already seek job training assistance.

A key component of this plan allows workers who become reemployed within 13 weeks to keep the balance of their account as a cash reemployment bonus. In addition, these reemployment accounts empower individual recipients to make choices appropriate for their own circumstances. Recipients will be able to create reemployment accounts that help them navigate all of the options that are available, such as career counseling or job training for a new profession. In providing choice and flexibility, I think we get people back to work into steady, good-paying jobs sooner.

For those who are struggling to get back on their feet, we in Congress, I think, have a responsibility to look for additional solutions to help them when they need it most. The intent of this bill is clear: this new benefit supplements and enhances the services that are already available for those who are most likely to face obstacles in finding and keeping new employment, whether it be unemployment benefits or the employment training programs offered through the Workforce Investment Act.

The bill before us is a pilot project, a scaled-back version of a more comprehensive proposal that the Committee on Education and the Workforce approved last year. Our goal here is to put this program to a test, see how it works in practice, and determine whether it truly gives unemployed workers an option, a workable option to help them improve their job search. The lessons learned through this pilot project will give Congress more information on how best to serve those who are looking for work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for their work on this measure and last year's bill as well. During hearings that we had last year, we heard from State leaders at a field hearing in Nevada about the practical benefits of these reemployment accounts in helping the unemployed. We also heard from Labor Secretary Elaine Chao, who said that the accounts “will empower individuals by giving them more flexibility, personal choice, and

control over their job search and career.”

Over the past 2 years, we have taken numerous steps to help unemployed workers, and we are also in the process of reauthorizing the Federal job-training programs under the Workforce Investment Act. Millions of jobless workers should not have to wait for job-training reform, and Congress has an obligation this year to improve those job-training opportunities for American workers. Unfortunately, it appears, though, that some in the other body want to block major job-training legislation that would help strengthen training and retraining opportunities for American workers. I think if given the opportunity, we look forward to completing work on that legislation this year.

But Congress must act now to provide new, innovative options to help workers as quickly as possible, and the choice and flexibility available through personal reemployment accounts will help more Americans get back on their feet and find good jobs.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 444, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill completely misses the mark. American workers need job creation. American workers also need extended unemployment benefits. This sour economy has lost 2 million jobs since President Bush took office. This bill does nothing to address these issues, the most pressing facing our workforce today. Instead, H.R. 444 creates an untested and risky job-training voucher scheme.

This voucher scheme cuts off workers from regular job-training benefits when they accept a PRA. This legislation also demeans workers by assuming that those receiving unemployment benefits need a financial lure to go back to work.

I am not sure about other congressional districts, but unemployed workers in Flint, Michigan, my hometown, and other areas of Michigan do not need an incentive to find work. They are in desperate search of work right now. They do not need an incentive to be able to afford their mortgage or to provide for their family. They need jobs.

□ 1115

I am surprised there are those in this body that think that American workers need a financial incentive to find a job. The real story behind this bill is that it simply fails to address the most pressing needs of the American worker. It is a sham.

Let us look at the real problems facing the American worker. Two million jobs have been lost since the beginning of the Bush administration, 8.2 million individuals are unemployed, 1.5 million workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits, wages have barely

kept up with inflation, and this bill does nothing to address these problems.

Substantive help for American workers lies in an initiative to create jobs and to extend unemployment insurance. Yet this Republican Congress and the Bush administration has continually failed to address these needs. The last extension of UI benefits ran out late last year. Despite some meager job growth in the past few months, we remain two million jobs in the hole since the beginning of the Bush administration. The Republican answer to these problems is a pilot project for job training vouchers.

This bill brings no new resources to help American workers. Instead, it would steal funding from other proven job training programs. How could this respond to the needs of the American workers?

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this bill. We need real-world solutions to real-world problems, not unfunded, untested legislation which will not address the true needs of the American worker.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, it seems that in these debates we so often get sidetracked into discussions of ideology, and I think it is important we focus on the bill before us. I certainly have great respect for those on the minority side and understand and appreciate some of their concerns.

I think it is important that we point out that this is a pilot bill. This is not something that is going to directly impact all workers everywhere in the country. And the reason I think this is important to point out is that, as the chairman mentioned, there will be several different programs that people can allocate their money into. And let us see if Congress cannot find out exactly where people want to put their money.

So if 50 percent of the money goes to child care, and 10 percent goes to enhancing computer skills, and 40 percent goes into career counseling, pretty soon Congress is going to get a picture as to what is really important to workers and where those resources need to be allocated. This certainly represents an innovative approach to providing assistance to unemployment workers.

As the chairman mentioned, we live in a different world. I think the average worker today may have as many as four or five different jobs. And this is not necessarily because the economy is bad, it is simply because the economy is changing consistently. So almost everyone at one time or another is going to be between jobs or without a job.

I think this approach offers some unique opportunities. It certainly offers great flexibility, and this is the critical part in job training. It may

have to do with computer skills, it may be earning a license to be a realtor, a financial planner, or 1 year at a community college, which I think is a tremendous option for a great many people. We feel also that child care, transportation, career counseling, relocation services, housing assistance are viable alternatives as well.

The last thing I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, is simply the fact that there are some incentives here for people to not only get a job but to have some money, some seed money to get started on their new career. For instance, as an example, a person had a \$3,000 grant and \$2,000 of it was spent, maybe some of it on community college, some for child care, and there was \$1,000 remaining. This would leave \$600 at employment that person could use to get back on their feet and \$400 to be used after 6 months of employment.

So we think that this is certainly an interesting and flexible approach. I urge support of this bill, H.R. 444.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his handling of this bill for the minority on the floor and his work on it in the committee.

And the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) is quite right. We should oppose this bill. I have to say that I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are simply describing a bill that is not before us, because they talk about this as being supplemental and providing flexibility to the unemployed worker.

Now, clearly, we would like to do that, because we have 8 million unemployed individuals in this country. We have 90,000 people who are exhausting their unemployment benefits a week in this country who still have not been unable to find employment, who are in desperate straits. So, clearly, there is a need for what they are describing.

But let us understand something. What they are describing in terms of flexibility is already available in the law under the WIA bill that we are in the process of reauthorizing. They can provide you child care stipends if it helps you take advantage of a computer training program or a program at the community college or a program of a collaborative in your community. They can provide you a transportation voucher to get to that program if that is what is necessary.

That is why we designed the law that way, because we know that the unemployed come to these programs, and their needs are varied. Some people have automobiles, and some people do not. Some people have access to transportation, and some people do not. Their child care came with the job, and now they have lost it. That is why we built in that flexibility in the current program.

What this says is if you go for the bait on the hook, which is a grant, that could be up to \$3,000, you are then prohibited from participating in those programs unless you take the \$3,000 or the \$500 or the \$700. Because at \$3,000 you are only going to take care of 16,000 people. We have 90,000 people who are losing their unemployment benefits a week. But if you take the \$500, you then have to pay for the programs that are currently available to you in your community under the WIA act for free.

What is the deal here, folks? You are no better off. It is not supplemental. You have just lost your eligibility to what may be very good, comprehensive training programs.

In my community, industry is coming to community colleges and to the work incentive force all of the time to say we would like to structure a program in the community to provide us X number of people in biotechnology and high technology and refining business, whatever it is. That is the needs in our community.

You take this \$500 voucher, you lose the eligibility to go to those programs. This is neither flexible nor supplemental. It takes away what people now have available to them. And if you took this \$50 million, which obviously, given the President's memo on 2006, is going to be cut from other job training programs, if you added \$50 million, you could provide much more child care to those individuals who need that to participate in retraining and to get ready for the next employment opportunity or need transportation costs covered so they can get to the community college or they can get to the training program or to the licensure program, whatever it is they choose. That is all available in law today.

The Republicans have said this is Career Week. This is Career Week in the United States House of Representatives. The only career we keep dealing with is legislation that doesn't do anything. We are making a career out of providing answers that do not answer the questions that workers are asking. We have got to stop this.

We ought to get on with the WIA bill. We ought to get it reauthorized. We ought to make sure that the funding is there so that all of the flexibility that is in that law can be utilized by the 8 million American workers who are looking for jobs in this economy and have been unable to find them.

So I would hope that my colleagues would join the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and vote against this legislation, understanding that this is harmful and, in fact, it will subtract from the total job training package that this government is making available to those unemployed and to their families.

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

Mr. Speaker, we probably would not be here today if the other body would actually go to conference on the reauthorization of the Workforce Invest-

ment Act. But I think all of us realize that they have been unwilling to go to conference, and we believe that we have got every responsibility known to man to help those people who are unemployed and need help.

Secondly, let me say that, once again, we are getting into a debate about the perfect becoming the enemy of the good. What this bill does is set up a pilot project that allows unemployed workers who qualify the option of this \$3,000 reemployment bonus. The real key here is that they, the unemployed workers, get to decide what kind of training they need, what kind of education they might need, what kind of services they may need to help them get back on their feet and into good work. They get to decide, not some bureaucrat in some office somewhere. They get to decide.

And this option of allowing them that flexibility, I think, is worth trying. That is what we are asking for today: Let us try this. Let us see what happens. Let us see if this additional flexibility for unemployed workers does, in fact, help them get the training, retraining they may need to find a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) the author of this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 444 for multiple reasons.

First of all, we are facing an ever-changing economy both nationally and internationally. Could you imagine just a few years ago going to the gas station and you would not have help or an attendant, you would have a piece of technology taking your credit card, you enter it into the gas pump, or go to the grocery store where people are being replaced by technology? Can you imagine going to rental car agency and it all being done electronically? So we are facing quite a change in the world and here in the U.S.

Nevada, as my colleagues know, is one of the fastest-growing states in the country but is also the entertainment and resort capital of the world. There was a day when we depended solely on the gaming economy. Not only gaming today is number one, we are the top shopping destination and restaurant destination in the world because we have had to change and change dramatically.

The National Chamber of Commerce has said that 40 percent of the jobs in the future do not exist today. They have also said that 75 percent of the workers as we know them today must change their skills and their technology.

Then we look at what happened after 9/11. September 11 changed the world. The community of Nevada was literally out of business for 90 days. But because of the resilient business community, because of labor working in concert with our resort industry, we are coming back stronger than ever.

The Nevada impacts are such that we are now the bellwether for the economy across the United States. The economy is turning around as Nevada has turned around. People are getting back to work. In Nevada alone we have created close to 60,000 new jobs in the last year. We are in a 4.3 percent unemployment rate, a true bellwether for the economy as it is improving across the country.

And credit goes to labor and business working together. As our business communities change, as has our labor community, such as the Culinary Union working closely with business. But nationwide housing starts, all-time high; gross national product, all-time high; Wall Street, every day we are seeing improvements. Nationwide, 1.1 million new jobs since last August, 625,000 jobs in March and April alone.

But, more importantly, the greatness of society, the greatness of America is not based upon our checkbooks. It is what we do to help those folks that need help. H.R. 444 does just that. It provides a voluntary program, a voluntary program for States to choose if they want to be a part of this program. It is a demonstration project, but, more importantly, it is a new tool to train our workers in this new global environment.

The benefits, we have touched upon them this morning but I would like to cover them one more time.

Transportation. Many of these folks in Nevada have a hard time getting to the job for the interview.

Day care. Why not allow moms and dads to have some assistance? Many need a telephone, simply a telephone to help receive that call when the job is available.

And Nevada, being one of the fastest-growing States regarding the Hispanic population, we need help with language and language barriers.

There are those that will say that these tools exist today. I am sorry, but it is very complex, very confusing. This provides for a one-stop, easy access and a matter-of-fact choice. So the employee who needs help the most can make the decision and receive the balance if they are employed within the 13 weeks.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this very important tool as we enter this new environment, provide a new tool for a new economy. It is flexible, it is voluntary, and it provides choice for the employee.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 444, and I appreciate Members' votes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for yielding me time, and I thank him for his work in opposition to this

bill. I think he has it exactly right, Mr. Speaker. These PRAs, as they are called, the personal reemployment accounts, are presented to us in the face of over 2 million jobs lost under this present Republican administration. One and a half million workers have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. President Bush and the House Republicans refuse to extend those unemployment benefits despite these facts.

Even Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan thinks it is a good idea to extend those benefits. The money is already in the trust fund. It is the right thing to do morally. We have done it in the past, in the first Bush administration. We did it five times. It is the economically wise thing to do. For every dollar invested in unemployment benefits, \$1.73 comes back into the economy because people that get it have needs. They have rent or mortgage payments to make. They have health care bills, car payments, education costs, groceries. That is what this economy needs right now to give those people a boost so they can survive while they are looking for a job.

But the administration and the Republicans in the House seem afraid that extending those benefits will be an admission of their failed economic policies, the fact that we have had two tax cuts for millionaires while we are fighting two wars, and regular Americans are the ones being asked to sacrifice. So these so-called PRAs are offered, actually they are reoffered as you have heard, as this is a bill that was already presented through the House and advisedly passed. It provides no employment, no unemployment benefits, no job creation. There is no new money to get people to work. In fact, it is going to be funded through cuts in existing programs. And because we are \$500 billion in deficit, it is pretty clear that there is not going to be enough money there for the \$3,000 that people are talking about. It is going to in fact be far less per person.

In brief, it is robbing from proven programs that are effective job-training programs for an experiment that is designed to fail. It is built on a false premise. We had Secretary Chao come before the committee and when asked why she would not extend unemployment insurance benefits, she said because the administration thought that was an incentive for people not to look for work. That is an insulting, false premise. Two million people are involuntarily unemployed during this term. For every three people looking, there is only one job. Many people that are getting a job are getting it at 21 percent less pay than the job that they lost.

Although the bill proposes \$3,000, it is more likely that people will get far less. The one-stop centers that we have now are the centers that have the flexibility. They are serving the needs of people. In fact, they provide for the other things that were talked about, as the gentleman from California (Mr.

GEORGE MILLER) said. But what they want to do here is take a program that averages 5 to \$6,000 in costs for job-training programs now available to individuals that have lost their jobs and substitute it for up to \$3,000 which will fall far short in which they are supposed to pay for that 5 to \$6,000 worth of job training and child care and transportation and housing assistance and relocation services and career counseling.

This must be a miracle \$3,000 per person because it is shrinking as the needs are there. The present system, Mr. Speaker, is working. It is one that people have worked on in a bipartisan nature. This is what we need to do, not false programs, but deal with the real needs of the unemployed. Give them extended unemployment benefits and give them a chance to get a job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Does the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) wish to control the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER)?

Mr. MCKEON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) will control the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the vice-chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for yielding me time. I thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for his work on this.

The discussion I have just heard was about what this bill is not. I would like to talk for a second about what this bill is.

This is a creative opportunity at the election of the local WIA board and at the election of the applicant for the grant to take a creative approach to take someone from unemployment to employment.

Now, outside the Beltway there is a real world; and in the 22 years prior to my election to this Congress, I ran a company, a company substantially all of whose employees were second or third career which meant they might have come out of a job loss, a job transfer, or a temporary unemployment because of the birth of a child or illness or whatever. And I can tell you in this unique world that we live in there is not a one-size-fits-all formula in terms of the requirements necessary for re-employment.

To allow the option for a local board to create these personal reemployment accounts and the option for an individual to accept the waiver and apply for the funds does the following things: it takes a person who is otherwise employable but in need of specific targeted help, whether it is in specific training, whether it is in child care or whether it is in transportation, to do a

tailor-made job to go into employment, and I employed people that way every day for 22 years before I came to Congress.

It is a creative way to approach the needs of some people in looking for employment.

Secondly, what is so important for us to consider today is the present-day environment. The number of unemployed has been reduced from its peak because the American economy is improving. Those that are unemployed in many cases may be those who are more in need of specialized training or help that otherwise might have been true a year ago or 6 months ago. It is only right to grant that flexibility. And as long as we cannot get an agreement to go to conference on the base bill that now lies in limbo, it is only appropriate we take the right initiative.

I want to end with this. There are two basic motivators in human nature. One is risk and the other is reward. This approach takes the reward approach and the incentive approach and even in the end has the encouragement for residual funds to remain with the grantee, if they are employed earlier than they otherwise might have been.

Any other approach is for people to fear flexibility, to fear choice, and to fear creativity. Those are not things we should fear. Just as we proved in welfare-to-work, with targeted funds, with flexibility, with child care, with training, we could take a life of dependency and turn it into a life of independence. I will subscribe to that every single time.

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

Chairman Greenspan before the Committee on Education and the Workforce indicated that he supports the extension of unemployment benefits. And after he made that statement, of course, the President of the United States announced that he would reappoint Alan Greenspan, would extend his tenure. Well, if he does that, let us extend those unemployment benefits which Mr. Greenspan supports.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the 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, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for yielding me time. I rise in opposition to the bill.

I suppose if you are one of the 8 million unemployed Americans listening to this debate, Mr. Speaker, you wonder what this bill would mean to you. First, if you live in one of the many, many States that would not be part of this pilot program, it means nothing. Second, if you are in one of the States or counties that has the pilot program, you keep hearing about this \$3,000, there is no \$3,000. This bill was not funded in the President's budget.

If money would be scraped together for it, it would come out of something

else that helps unemployed people. It is up to \$3,000. So someone listening to this, Mr. Speaker, should not assume that he or she is going to get a \$3,000 voucher. But let us assume that you live in one of the pilot counties and the money is there to some extent. What does this mean? It means you are unemployed and you get a choice. You can either take all the services that the law presently provides like job training, like counseling, like transportation, like child care; or you can give up your right to receive those services for a year and take this check off of up to \$3,000 instead.

Now, if you have looked at the price of sending children to child care, \$3,000 does not go very far. If you have looked at tuition at a career college or a community college, \$3,000 does not go very far. If you have looked at the things that people need to do to get to work or find work, it does not go very far at all. So the premise of the bill seems to be that people are not taking jobs because it is better to stay on unemployment than it is to go get a job. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who thinks that has probably never been on unemployment.

The idea here is not that the \$3,000 is going to be an incentive for people to go get a job. People are not taking jobs because the economy is not creating the jobs. For every three people looking for work in America today, there is one job. That is the problem that we ought to fix. We ought to extend unemployment benefits for those without a job. We ought to pass the transportation bill so that we put 300,000 Americans to work. We ought to adopt the Ryan proposal from yesterday that would create 100,000 new jobs for first responders to deal with our homeland security problems. That is the way to fix this problem. Not this bill.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the original author and I would describe as the father of the Workforce Investment Act. I applaud him on his good work.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 444, the Worker Reemployment Accounts Act, which offers new assistance for unemployed workers in the form of personal reemployment accounts that would help workers that need it the most return to work quickly.

I would like to thank my good friend from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for his hard work and the things he has done in getting this legislation here, and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for his work and leadership in getting this bill to the floor.

With 1.1 million new jobs created in the last 8 months, and 625,000 jobs added in March and April, it is clear that our economy is strong and on the right track. The economic forecast for

the manufacturing sector is also bright after adding jobs for 3 consecutive months. In fact, on Tuesday the Institute for Supply Management reported that its manufacturing employment index advanced in May for the seventh consecutive month and is now at the highest mark in 31 years. Moreover, the unemployment rate fell to 5.6 percent in April, lower than the average unemployment rate during the 70s, 80s and 90s.

As an example, my home State of California added more than 61,000 jobs from December 2003 to April 2004. Under the leadership of the President and Congress who are focusing our efforts to make America more globally competitive, our Nation's economy is strengthening and adding momentum every month. Despite these encouraging signs, we need to do more to help displaced workers get back on their feet. The Worker Reemployment Accounts Act is a step in the right direction and an innovative approach to helping workers find good paying jobs.

The bill authorizes funding for a pilot program that would help workers with personal reemployment accounts of up to \$3,000 to purchase employment-related services to help them return to work. This is a flexible approach that empowers Americans to find good-paying jobs. Funds from these accounts can be used for job training, career counseling, relocation services, child care, and housing assistance among others.

One of the best elements of the plan is that any unspent balance in the account can be kept by workers who find work within 13 weeks. It is a great incentive.

The personal reemployment account will be administered through the one-stop career center system established under the Workforce Investment Act, where displaced workers already seek employment assistance. State and local workforce boards that want to participate will apply to the Secretary of Labor for competitive grants to offer personal reemployment accounts to unemployed workers.

An individual who receives an account must be receiving unemployment benefits, be identified by the State as likely to exhaust his or her benefits, and be eligible for at least 20 weeks of unemployment compensation. These accounts are a new benefit that would work in tandem with unemployment insurance as an additional vehicle for helping workers in their efforts to find good jobs. It would not create an entirely new and complicated system to administer, as some on the other side of the aisle are proposing.

Over the past 2 years, Republicans have taken numerous steps to help unemployed workers, and this is another way we are responding to needs of Americans who find themselves without work.

The U.S. economy is strong and getting stronger. By giving job seekers all the necessary resources they need to

return to work, we will continue this economic resurgence to keep the U.S. jobs-creation engine running strong. The Worker Reemployment Accounts Act provides a unique approach to helping displaced workers return to good jobs and deserves every Member's support.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

□ 1145

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his leadership on this issue and helping working people in our country; and, Mr. Speaker, let me say I wish that the comments of the last speaker, my colleague, were true in regards to the economy, but the facts speak to something quite different.

If we take a look at the jobs that have been created within the last several months, we find we have traded very good jobs, jobs in this country, for jobs that are paying much lower wages. When we look at the total record over the last 3 years, we find we have lost millions of jobs. When we look at the unemployment rate in this Nation, we find that many people have just given up hope, and that is why the unemployment rate may appear to be higher than it really is, but many people in this Nation who are looking for jobs cannot find jobs and have literally left the labor field altogether.

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem in our economy, and the problem can first be summed by saying we do not have enough jobs. We need an economic program that will create more jobs for Americans.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, we have millions of Americans who cannot find employment, and they need help called unemployment insurance, which in every prior recession and downturn Democrats and Republicans have come together to extend unemployment benefits. We have a fund to do this. There are millions of dollars in that fund, but yet the majority refuses to allow us to vote on the unemployment compensation.

So the first issue is the issue of jobs, and we need an economic plan that will create jobs. Unfortunately, the administration has pursued a fiscally reckless economic plan that has added trillions of dollars to our national debt and is killing jobs rather than creating jobs because of government debt.

The record over the last 3 years, millions of fewer jobs here in this Nation. People are hurting, Mr. Speaker. We need to do something about it. Eight million Americans are unemployed today; 1.8 million of them have been without a job for 6 months or longer. We have record numbers of people who have exhausted their State unemployment benefits.

Since we allowed last year the expiration of the Federal unemployment insurance benefits, we have found 1.5

million workers have exhausted their State benefits without the benefit of the Federal unemployment insurance; yet, the Republican leadership has refused us a vote on this floor of an extension of the Federal unemployment insurance benefits. They know that a majority of the Members of this body would vote in favor of that legislation, and yet they deny us a vote on the extension of unemployment benefits. Nineteen billion dollars is sitting in the Federal unemployment trust account, \$19 billion which is accumulated exactly for this purpose, to help the unemployed worker; and the majority of Republicans refuse to allow us a vote on extending those benefits to those who need it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. We have a problem with the wrong economic program, and we have a problem of not helping those people that are unemployed.

This bill does nothing in that regard. We should be debating programs to create new job opportunities in America, and we should be extending unemployment benefits to those who do not have the employment. I regret that we are not doing that today.

I would urge my colleagues to listen to the motion to recommit, because that is the only opportunity we are going to have that will be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that at least will give us a chance to help us do something to help American workers.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) very much for the time, and it is a pleasure to work with him on the committee to protect the rights of workers and also to speak to the concern of unemployed Americans.

I rise to strongly oppose H.R. 444, the Worker Reemployment Accounts Act of 2004. I would like to begin with a reflection here.

Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, recently appeared in Washington to talk about unemployment and about unemployment insurance, and he said "that when unemployment is created, through no fault of the workers' actions, then I think it is clearly to our advantage to find ways of creating support in our system, and as a consequence, in times like this, I have supported the issue of extension of unemployment insurance." That is Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve.

Now, there is an urgency about this issue about unemployment, and I would submit that the solution that is being offered today by our friends in the majority is a false solution. We have the chairman of the Federal Reserve ready to recognize the urgency of unemployment insurance. It is obvious that we ought to be providing for an

extension of unemployment insurance to meet the needs of those millions of Americans who are desperate today for Congress to take action. Why are they desperate? Well, let us look at what happened.

The economic record of this administration will show that over a period from January of 2001 to April 2004, there has, in fact, been a substantial increase in the unemployment rate from 4.2 percent in January 2001 to 5.6 percent in April of 2004. Let us look more closely at this.

What we have here is of great consequence to millions of Americans because in this period, from January 2001 to April 2004, we have seen long-term unemployment nearly triple. In other words, there are not only more people unemployed, but more people are unemployed for longer periods of time, which means a tremendous adverse economic impact on their families.

In January 2001, there were approximately 680,000 people in this country who were unemployed more than 26 weeks; but now, in April of 2004, under the economic policies of this administration, the unemployment rate for those who have been unemployed for more than 26 weeks has gone to 1.8 million, nearly three times. This, of course, means that there is real desperation on the part of many American families to get some help.

Now, let us put this in a historical context. How do we take the economic policies of this administration with respect to job creation and with respect to the lack thereof and put it against all administrations over the last 70 years? This comparison is noteworthy because what we see here is that going all the way back to the time of Herbert Hoover, there has not been a worse condition where we have seen an actual decline in private sector jobs. In this whole arc of a 70-year period, we see in one administration after another, Democrat and Republican alike, this administration has failed to meet the tests that all other administrations, Democratic and Republican alike, have met; and, in fact, we have here an actual decline in private sector jobs, only in this administration.

So what should be the solution right now with so many people suffering? We have been told this by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Our unemployment system is very well structured, and it has worked the way I think we wanted it to work. Alan Greenspan again said that on March 11 of this year.

So we should be here talking today about an extension of unemployment benefits. Not only is it important in terms of recognizing the abysmal failure of an administration in dealing with the creation of jobs, but with knowing the suffering of working families who are not getting any relief whatsoever at a time when the fund, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) pointed out, keep building up and up. What are we going to do with

all this money? Instead, we have a bill which apparently those who crafted it believe that left to their own devices the 8.2 million unemployed workers in America would prefer to simply remain jobless.

With that analysis and thus the theory that underlies, this bill is absolutely wrong. Unemployed Americans are unemployed not because they want to be, but because they cannot find jobs. Since the recession began 37 months ago, 2.2 million private sector jobs have disappeared, a 2 percent contraction in the job market. In every previous episode of recession and job decline since 1939, the number of jobs fully recovered to above the pre-recessionary peak within 31 months at the start of the recession. This time, however, it has not happened. In fact, if employment had grown by the 2.2 percent rate that occurred in the past three recessionary cycles, today's labor market would have 5.2 million more jobs. Instead, we can all point to lost jobs, and that is all we can point to and more lost jobs.

Well, the administration has responded to the situation by refusing to extend Federal unemployment benefits, an action that is already paid for by the unemployment trust fund; 1.5 million workers remain without a paycheck and without an unemployment check. The number of individuals who have exhausted their State unemployment benefits without finding work is at the highest level ever recorded.

This bill ought to be defeated. It is a nonsolution. It is time for Congress to act in bringing unemployment insurance extension to the floor of this House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), the author of this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the top five false claims that we have heard today about H.R. 444 with some of the facts.

False claim number 5: a reemployment bonus cannot motivate workers to find jobs that do not exist. The truth: as Republicans, our tax and growth programs over the past year have created 1.1 million new jobs, 625,000 coming in March and April. These job opportunities are becoming more available, and we have to ensure that those chronically unemployed have the new tools and new skills to face this new economy.

False claim number 4: PRAs do not provide workers with greater flexibility. Rather, if workers choose a PRA, they would be prohibited from using WIA services for a full year. Mr. Speaker, the truth: reemployment accounts provide the unemployed with a means of developing an individual specific plan for regaining employment. The prohibition against WIA services is to prevent double dipping. I think that is appropriate.

False claim number 3: PRAs will be used as an excuse to not extend the

Temporary Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program. The truth, Mr. Speaker: Republicans have consistently supported extending unemployment benefits. These PRAs are a supplemental approach to benefits and represent one more way that Republicans are using to help Americans find new jobs and get back to work quickly.

False claim number 2: reemployment accounts come at the expense of other WIA job training and employment programs. The truth, Mr. Speaker: while appropriators will ultimately determine the allocation of these dollars, the funding for PRAs will flow through the discretionary fund of demonstration projects, not the funds used for other services.

False claim number 1 on the top of the list: H.R. 444 would restrict, rather than expand, the amount of job training and other reemployment services. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have prioritized funding for job training. Reemployment accounts are a voluntary program that allows for personalized and streamlined reemployment services. No one is forced to use the account, and the purpose of the legislation is to provide the most effective use of funds for the unemployed.

□ 1200

Again, I encourage strong support for H.R. 444.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that he ought to read the bill, because truth and facts are about what the language of the bill says.

If you read on line 16, page 15, "For the 1-year period following the establishment of the account, recipients may not receive intensive, supportive, or training services funded under this title except for the fee-for-services basis."

The gentleman obviously has not read the bill. That means that you either pay for it with the stipend the gentleman says he wants to give them, which provides them no additional new services, no flexibility. So do not stand up here and talk about facts or truth. Read the bill. Read the bill, and the gentleman will find out what he is doing is denying them the services that are already available to them today.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this bill would establish a demonstration project that would ostensibly offer personal reemployment accounts to workers, providing up to \$3,000 in assistance for the purpose of finding a job and paying for services that would help lead to employment.

Sounds good on the surface, but, as with every bill this administration puts forward that impacts workers, there is a catch. Employment services

now offered through the One Stop Centers, at no cost to the unemployed worker, would have to be purchased, meaning that unemployed workers would now be charged for services that they can currently receive for free.

To give an idea of the difference, those who utilize One Stop job training programs right now receive an average of \$5,000 to \$6,000 in services, about double the maximum allowed under this bill. So we should not be fooled. The goal of this bill is not to provide additional reemployment services or job training funding for unemployed workers; rather, it is to pave the way for placing a Federal cap on these services.

In an economy with a million and a half workers who have already exhausted their unemployment benefits, reducing these services without providing any job creation program is not only bad economic policy it is outright dismissive of what these families are going through day after day, particularly women in transition, nearly half of whom are already finding Workforce Investment Act services, like local women's education and training programs, insufficient.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployed workers in this country do not need "an incentive" to look for work. Supporting a family without a job is incentive enough. What they need is a job. Congress should be expanding job training and job training access, not limiting them, as next year's budget does. We should be extending health and unemployment benefits to the unemployed, not letting them expire in the face of serious unemployment.

Historically, this country, Republican or Democrat administrations, have extended unemployment benefits in time of need. As a Nation, we have said we are going to help people on a temporary basis meet these unemployment challenges that they have. Not this administration. What do they say? They say, if we extend those benefits, people will not go out and look for a job. That is the opinion they have of working people in this Nation.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, walk in the shoes of the unemployed; understand what it means to live paycheck to paycheck. We do not have to worry about that in this body. There are folks in this country who worry about that every single day. The unemployed workers in this country deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

There was a discussion here about what would happen if workers chose to take a \$3,000 personal reemployment account and their ability to access services at the Career One Stops. I just want to set the record straight.

While it is true that recipients would be prohibited from accessing intensive or training services through the One Stop career system for 1 year after the creation of the account, unless, unless

the person with the account chooses to purchase services there, however, all individuals remain eligible for the core services provided by the Career One Stop. Such services include job search and placement assistance, including career counseling, where appropriate, and access to labor market information.

Now the idea here is that we allow individuals \$3,000, giving them the right to choose the types of services that they think will help them get back on their feet and find a good job. They can purchase those services at the Career One Stop or they can go down the street and go to a community college if they want. But the core services that the Career One Stops provide for all individuals, these persons with the \$3,000 personal reemployment accounts, would still be eligible for those core services.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is about time we address unemployment. Unfortunately, H.R. 444 is not the legislation that will truly put Americans back to work. It offers only a temporary solution for a limited pool of unemployed workers and is a poor solution to the ongoing unemployment problem of this Nation.

Rather than PRAs, personal reemployment accounts, we need across-the-board investments in the Workforce Investment Act, WIA, and the Unemployment Insurance, UI, programs. These are the existing programs that need help so a broader number of workers stabilize their lives and develop the necessary skills to secure new jobs. Proper funding of these programs would make the difference. Finding ways to give unemployed workers real jobs is the real solution to the national unemployment problem, not a bill that puts additional burdens on the States, threatening to undo the Federal unemployment system in the first place.

Let me also remind my colleagues that \$1 billion invested in highways and transit creates 47,500 new jobs. If we really want to create jobs, we should be moving forward with the transportation bill. These jobs pay a living wage, give workers the opportunity to better their communities, while at the same time supporting their families.

H.R. 444 is not a real solution. The real solution would grant unemployment extensions when finding work takes longer than the length of the initial benefits, not a bill that forces workers to choose between receiving

WIA benefits or PRA benefits with no flexibility to go back to one when the other is exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 444 is false security.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for his leadership as chairman on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He is doing a tremendous job. I also want to thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for this important legislation that he has introduced. I am also a cosponsor.

Education and retraining are the keys to ensuring that the American worker is the most competitive in the world. Now, this is week three of 8 weeks that the House is dedicating to addressing issues to bring jobs back into America. These eight issues are all very important because they are costs that are outside the control of employers. They are costs that are driven by the Federal Government. We are going to lower those costs by undoing some of the work Congress has done over the last generation and freeing up employers to bring jobs back into America.

This week, we also have passed the Teacher Training Enhancement Act, the Teacher Shortage Response Act, the Priorities for Graduate Studies Act, and now we are addressing H.R. 444, the Worker Reemployment Accounts Act.

One of the things I notice about the complaints about this bill from the other side is that we want to tell people what to do. This bill gives them flexibility. They can go out and get job training. They can get child care. They can provide for transportation or career counseling. The opponents of this bill do not want to provide choices because they do not trust Americans. They want to tell people what to do with their benefits. On the Republican side, we say we trust people to make good choices if they are given some opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give an example of a mother of three, who was working at the Rathen Corporation in Wichita, Kansas. She wanted to finish her degree, and she got laid off. She could not provide for her child care, so she had to bring her mother back in from out of town to live with her while she went back to Wichita State University and completed her degree. With this legislation, she would have been able to carry on her education while her children were taken care of; and her mother would not have had to quit her job and move into her daughter's house.

This bill gives people flexibility so they can go out and get the child care they need. It is a good piece of legislation. It is part of bringing jobs back to America, and I urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. What we should be doing today is voting to extend unemployment benefits. However, the Republican leadership will not let that amendment be offered, even though or maybe because they know it would pass.

Not only will the majority not assist workers who need jobs, but the authors of this bill assert that unemployed workers need financial incentive to get a job. Now, ask the workers whose jobs have been outsourced whether they need financial incentive to get a job. I am really shocked that the authors of this bill believe the American workers effectively need to be bribed to get a job.

American workers are not looking for handouts. They are looking for jobs. And, even worse, this bill would effectively bar the recipients of this money from receiving actual job training. Contrary to, and I must respectfully differ from the chairman, contrary to what he says, they would not get actual job services. Sure, at a job center, if they find an open computer, they might be able to use it to prepare a resume, but they will not get the counseling they need. They will not get the training they need. This bill would deny workers the important training opportunities they need.

This Nation has lost more than 2 million jobs under this administration. We should be dealing with the unemployment needs of these workers. I ask my colleagues to oppose this risky scheme.

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

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

I think all of us realize that the American economy is changing, and I think it is changing at a more rapid pace than any of us would likely know. During a hearing several months ago, I found a number of statistics that I really found unusual. If we all think back for a moment to 1999, the American economy was in full bloom, the stock market was rising, employment levels were at all-time highs, yet in 1999 the American economy lost 35 million jobs. Yes, that is right. The American economy lost 35 million jobs. But, in 1999, the American economy also created 37 million new jobs, a net gain of 2 million jobs.

Now, let us move forward 3 years to 2002. And what happened in 2002? We had a recession, we had the effects of 9/11, we had a war going on in Afghanistan, and the American economy lost 35 million jobs in 2002. The American economy, though, in 2002, only created 33½ million new jobs.

This churning that we see in the American economy has always been there, but this churning we are now seeing is happening at a much faster pace than ever before; and, as a result, the need for job training, retraining,

and educational services for American workers is at an all-time high.

During our hearing, when we had Alan Greenspan in front of our committee, he said this: "We need to increase our efforts to ensure that as many of our citizens as possible have the opportunity to capture the benefits that flow from that engagement. For reasons that I shall elucidate shortly, one critical element in creating that opportunity is the provision of rigorous education and ongoing training to all members of our society. This proposal is not novel. It is, in fact, the strategy that we have followed successfully for most of the past century and a strategy that we now should embrace with renewed commitment."

Education and training and ongoing education and training for the American workforce is absolutely critical, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a lot said here today about the nature of our economy and what is happening, but in a U.S. News and World Report that is out today, dated June 7, Mort Zuckerman, in his editorial, says this:

"The economy is well on a tear. New jobs are being generated in large numbers. Income is growing at twice the rate of last year. And the exhilaration is such that we will probably see 5 percent growth in the gross domestic product. The jobs reports of the past few months have changed market sentiment. Sixty-one percent of private industries surveyed have added workers. That is the highest in 4 years. Business confidence has surged to a 20-year high, and business spending is exploding, with even American manufacturing joining the party. Companies that once saved every nickel are laying out more and more money as capital equipment to meet growing orders in double-digit rates."

He goes on to say later in the article, "We are on a trajectory toward extraordinary growth in the second half of 2004 that will beget stronger job and income growth, stronger retail spending, and accelerating demand at a time when businesses have cut costs, raising profit margins to their highest level in years.

□ 1215

"Higher profits will beget more spending, which will beget more business expansion, which will beget more income for workers which should trigger yet another increase in demand."

Do not look now, but the surging economy may be the real October Surprise. There is a real surge in our economy; and for Americans to take advantage of that surging economy, the kind of education and training that we allow under the Workforce Investment Act and provide for them should be helpful to them. These personal reemployment accounts are a pilot project to give them the choice about the kinds of services they need, the kinds of training or retraining they need to go out and take advantage of a surging economy to get a real job for the long term.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 444, the so-called the "Back to Work Incentive Act."

This bill is based on flawed assumptions and is an insult to the 1.8 million Americans—22 percent of the total unemployed—who have been out of work for more than 6 months. The Republicans believe that all long term unemployed Americans simply aren't looking for jobs because they are living comfortably on an average weekly unemployment benefit of \$256—or about 37 percent of their former wages. That's ridiculous!

H.R. 444 takes \$50 million of valuable funding from effective programs within the Workforce Investment Act to fund ineffective Personal Reemployment Accounts (PRAs). The purpose of these accounts is to provide an incentive payment of up to \$3,000 to unemployed workers to encourage them to find employment faster. It does this despite all of the research, which shows that PRAs don't work. You would think living off \$256 a week would be enough incentive to find work. However, these out-of-touch Republicans believe that \$256 a week allows households to pay for their mortgages, groceries, utility bills and college educations for their children.

If President Bush and House Republicans are so fond of linking bonuses to job performance, then we should offer the President a bonus if he actually creates jobs. Since President Bush came to office, 2 million American jobs have been lost. The problem with this economy isn't lazy unemployed workers, it's ineffective economic policy management.

Even more puzzling about this legislation is that the provisions of this bill do not make sense. Supporters argue that PRAs help workers get jobs because the money provided can be used for job training and other services such as child care and career counseling. However, if a worker were to get the maximum PRA of \$3,000 it would not be enough to pay for job training alone, which costs on average \$5,000–6,000. That doesn't take into account all the other costs unemployed workers confront.

Instead of wasting the American people's money on unproven programs, this Congress should extend unemployment benefits to the over 1.5 million workers who have exhausted their benefits and expand the funding for the free job training already provided under the Workforce Investment Act. These programs provide needy families with immediate economic relief and the necessary skills to find new jobs.

It is time that President Bush and the Republican Congress stop blaming unemployed workers for the lack of jobs in this country. Instead, the Republicans should show some leadership and take responsibility for their poor economic management.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 444 and ask the Republican leadership to consider legislation to actually help unemployed workers and create jobs in the United States.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 444, The Back to Work Incentive Act. The bill does nothing to help the current labor market, and offering workers re-employment bonuses does nothing to help the future of our nations unemployed and won't help put more jobs into our nation's struggling economy.

This bill is a careless attempt to replace the extension of unemployment benefits for the

long-term unemployed. This bill will help less than 0.2% of the unemployed and will do nothing for millions of jobless workers, particularly those out of work for more than 26 weeks.

The Back to Work Incentive provides a \$3,000 voucher for only about 15,000 eligible workers. These recipients will not be able to access free core services provided through the Workforce Investment Act and they will forfeit the opportunity to get up to \$10,000 in other possible Workforce Investment Act services and benefits available without cost under existing programs.

This bill also does not address the pressing problems of lack of available jobs, the need for marketable skills, and sufficient training funds for today's unemployed workers.

Mr. Speaker, in April alone 320,000 of America's workers exhausted their unemployment benefits. The Administration must come up with solutions that will provide jobs for all, not just benefits that are temporary for some. H.R. 444 doesn't cut it and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the bill before this body, H.R. 444, the Back to Work Incentive Act of 2003. More than 8.3 million individuals are out of work, and by one estimate, there are three workers for every available job. At the same time, over 1.2 million unemployed Americans who have exhausted their federal unemployment benefits are looking to Congress for urgent relief.

This sad trend means even more to the African American community. As of January 2004, the national unemployment rate was 5.6%. The African American unemployment rate was nearly twice that at 10.5%. Unemployment in this community has soared by 26% since reversing the trend of the Clinton era when African American unemployment declined by 48%; from 14.1% in January 1993 to 7.3% in December 2000.

In the City of Houston, the unemployment rate has decreased steadily from 6.6% to 6.0% from November 2003 to April 2004. This kind of trend is partly indicative of the success of job training programs that give workers the ability to not only retain employment but to improve their earning potential. The bill before us today will have a negative effect on the people of my District and the Districts of all of my colleagues and should be defeated.

H.R. 444 fails to provide the nation's most vulnerable workers urgently needed assistance and undermines key provisions of the existing Workforce Investment Act.

The crux of this legislation calls for the luring of financially strapped unemployed workers out of more intensive job training with a 'buy out' that could be as little as \$500 or less. Workers who are struggling must then decide whether to sign up for training or to accept additional financial support for their families.

However, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would really like to help these workers, they should work to extend unemployment benefits that will provide that urgently needed family support, with no draconian cap on job training services. H.R. 444 would require the unemployed to pay for otherwise free job counseling and training services and ban them from the system if they accept a Personal Re-employment Account (PRA).

H.R. 444 would undermine our workforce training and unemployment insurance sys-

tems. This bill not only ignores those families who need the help the most, it nullifies the accountability provisions contained in our job training programs. H.R. 444 would provide little if any oversight over program dollars spent on arbitrarily-chosen training providers. State certification requirements under the current WIA system would be all but removed with the PRA's—opening the door for financial abuse with no means to correct or even measure the potential abuses. Congress just revamped the job training system in 1998 to provide a comprehensive universal system of job assistance services, yet the Majority would circumvent their own system to create a new parallel program.

This bill also fails to provide relief quickly. The Congressional Budget Office says funds for this program would not even reach workers until next year—and one out of four eligible families would not be helped until fiscal year 2005. An unemployment insurance extension can provide help to workers in a matter of weeks, not months or years—and would create urgently needed short-term economic stimulus.

Rather than preparing for another extension of unemployment insurance that will be needed in the late spring, H.R. 444 seeks to utilize precious resources to provide assistance to the smallest fraction of the unemployed. This legislation is part of a strategy to undermine and cut funding to the unemployment and job-training systems and head-off another federal unemployment benefit extension that would provide assistance to those who desperately need it.

This legislation bars those who accept Personal Re-employment Accounts from receiving counseling and training services at a one-stop employment center for one year once the funds within the account are exhausted. Unemployed workers currently receive an average of \$5,000 (and as high as \$10,000) worth of training services under our current WIA system, and yet many of them are unable to find a sustainable job due to the jobless stagnation of the economy. H.R. 444 would cut millions of unemployed workers off from access to needed job training or re-training programs.

In addition, the infrastructure that would be required to administer the PRAs in the base bill would take several months, if not a year to set up, limiting what immediate help we can provide the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons stated above, I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would welcome a constructive approach to help people who are struggling with the consequences of long-term unemployment. For nearly three years now, Oregon has had one of the highest unemployment rates in the entire country. Largely for circumstances beyond our control—the national and international economies, the manipulation of energy markets—Oregonians have suffered. Unfortunately, this bill falls short of providing meaningful help to the 65,000 Oregonians who have lost their jobs during the Bush presidency.

This bill caps the benefit at \$3,000 per unemployed worker and provides no assurance that it will approach that much for most people. The one thing that is guaranteed is that recipients are cut off from other Federal programs for one year after they use their "re-employment accounts." This is a poor bargain with no guarantee of success.

Congress can and should do better than create a cynical shell game of taking away funding from existing Workforce Investment Act (WIA) programs and reusing them in a lesser, unestablished program. Congress should place its priorities behind what the President campaigned on and existing, productive programs: enhancing Pell Grants, fully funding the WIA, and using the \$14 billion already in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. Congress has established programs that are useful, flexible and creative that can help our 8.2 million unemployed workers. This new draconian proposal is ill-advised and unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kildee moves to recommit the bill H.R. 444 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be referred to as the "Emergency Worker Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT SUPPORT.

Section 171 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT SUPPORT.—

"(1) GRANTS TO STATES.—From the amount appropriated under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall make grants to States to provide financial and employment support to individuals who have exhausted their State unemployment benefits and can no longer receive, after the week of December 20, 2003, Federal extended temporary unemployment compensation, and who continue to be unemployed as of the date of enactment of the Emergency Worker Assistance Act. The eligibility criteria and benefit amounts under this paragraph for such individuals shall be the same as for such individuals prior to December 20, 2003, under the Federal extended temporary unemployment compensation program.

"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide continued unemployment support to ensure adequate emergency worker assistance and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KILDEE) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit is simple: It authorizes the extension of unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, 1.5 million workers have exhausted their initial unemployment benefits. These individuals have yet to find employment due to this very sour economy. Despite the need for these workers to provide for their families, this Congress has turned a deaf ear. We have continually failed to ensure the financial security of these workers and their families.

The question for this House is how can we pass legislation providing job-training vouchers when there are no jobs. We need to first ensure the financial security of those workers who have lost their jobs, and we have not done that. This amendment does that by authorizing the extension of unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral responsibility today. In Michigan and many other States around the country, job growth is nonexistent or anemic. Nationally, 8.2 million individuals are unemployed. The unemployment rate is 5.6 percent. It is quite evident that American workers want to work. The simple truth is that jobs do not exist. How long are we going to ignore the needs of the American workforce.

The underlying legislation is completely inadequate in addressing the problems facing the American worker. We cannot simply authorize a job-training voucher program. That does not meet the need. We have to act today, and we have to act now by extending unemployment benefits.

I want to remind Members that the House has considered nearly identical language to this motion to recommit during the debate on the Community Services Block Grant bill. I urge Members to support my motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Kildee motion to recommit H.R. 444. This motion does what is needed. The real problems that our country faces today are a lack of jobs and a lack of adequate unemployment benefits for unemployed workers who cannot find jobs. There are currently over 8 million workers who are unemployed. There are also an additional 4 million workers who are so discouraged about the job situation where they live that they are no longer looking for work, and there are another 4 million workers working part-time because they cannot find full-time work. What these workers need is income support until the economy fully recovers and produces enough jobs for them to support their families. These workers are not looking for a handout. They want to work, but where they live, there are no jobs.

Extended unemployment benefits give them the hand up that they need. Average benefits are only about \$200 a week. This amount is hardly enough to incentivize them to stay home indefinitely, yet that is what some would have us believe.

Mr. Speaker, 85,000 workers a week are exhausting their unemployment benefits; long-term unemployment is at the highest level in decades. The Kildee motion simply provides a minimum level of human decency to these hard-working Americans. They paid into the unemployment system, and the unemployment trust fund has over \$19 billion in it. Instead of pushing ineffective reemployment account voucher schemes, we should be providing unemployment support. Even Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, has supported such an extension. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

In conclusion, I would say adoption of my motion to recommit would really begin to touch immediately the needs of those people who are unemployed, rather than this anemic approach offered in the bill itself. I urge that we support the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means that deals with this.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit. This Republican Congress provided additional assistance to the unemployed when it was needed. Through laws passed in 2002 and 2003, nearly 8 million laid-off workers received more than \$23 billion in special Federal-extended unemployment benefits. Let me repeat that. Nearly 8 million people received \$23 billion in additional help. We continued that temporary program twice last year when unemployment was rising and the economy was shedding jobs.

Fortunately, today that situation has dramatically improved. The economy recently has been growing at the fastest rate in 20 years. President Bush's tax relief worked to turn the economy around. That is why unemployment continues to fall. During the past 12 months, unemployment rates have dropped in every region of the country, including in 47 States. Today's unemployment rate is lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Last month saw one of the steepest drops ever in the number of long-term unemployed. Nearly 1 million new jobs have been created this year alone, 138 million Americans are working now,

more than ever before in our Nation's history.

This suggests what we always knew, people want to work, not collect more unemployment benefits. Republicans are working hard to keep this tremendous economic and job growth going. This Democrat motion goes in the opposite direction. It will not help provide critical training for those seeking jobs.

Mr. Speaker, let us reject this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) has pointed out, we have extended unemployment benefits on several occasions and have provided tens of billions of dollars in support for those extensions.

The motion to recommit, if Members believe this is going to provide unemployment extensions to people, they are kidding themselves. What the Kildee motion does is create a new program within the Workforce Investment Act to extend unemployment benefits. This is not the usual unemployment system that we have that works really well. Under this proposal, we create a new program that is not funded. There is no funding in this bill for the program that is being created, and all this is going to do is bring false hope to millions of Americans who are out there trying to seek work who are on unemployment.

But the worst part of the motion to recommit is that it totally eliminates the underlying bill. For those of us who believe personal reemployment accounts are a good idea and that projects ought to be initiated to allow people up to \$3,000 to find the kind of training, retraining, and education they need in order to gain good employment, that entire bill is eliminated under the gentleman's motion to recommit.

I would urge my colleagues, let us not engage in a facade; let us not make empty promises to people who need our help and need our help badly. This is a new program. It is not funded. It will not extend unemployment benefits. Again, the worse part about it is it would eliminate the entire underlying bill and the personal reemployment accounts that we think will be helpful for American workers who are out of work. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion to recommit H.R. 444. We must support the workers who are desperately trying to find work before their benefits run out. Their families are the reason we must absolutely extend unemployment benefits, not pass legislation that will fundamentally change the Federal unemployment benefits system, like H.R. 444.

We need a real solution like extending unemployment benefits so families have the means to be healthy and safe when their jobs are no longer secure. How else will these families pay their heating bill, clothe their children, and feed their family?

These workers want work and seek work, and we must help them as they get back on their feet again. There is still too little job creation to write off the Federal Extended Benefits Program.

Mr. Speaker, today, 8.4 million people are out of work, 2.6 million private sector jobs have been lost since the beginning of the Bush Administration. Even worse, long-term unemployment is at the highest level in 10 years. As of April 2004, over 1 million people, in my home State of California, were unemployed.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe they are helping unemployed workers by creating these personal reemployment accounts. But my constituents are not writing me on a weekly basis asking for a brand new unemployment system. They simply want their unemployment benefits to continue until they find a job.

H.R. 444 is not the fix they are seeking. If my colleagues really listened to what the unemployed workers wanted they would grant families the security of benefits while they continue to seek work. That's why I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit H.R. 444 so we can address what workers really want.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes, as ordered, on passing H.R. 444 and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3866.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 216, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—199

Abercrombie	Costello	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Cramer	Goode
Alexander	Crowley	Gordon
Allen	Cummings	Green (TX)
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Baca	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Baird	Davis (FL)	Harman
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Davis (TN)	Herseth
Bell	DeFazio	Hill
Berkley	Delahunt	Hinchev
Berman	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Berry	Dicks	Hoeffel
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Holden
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Holt
Blumenauer	Dooley (CA)	Honda
Boswell	Doyle	Hooley (OR)
Boucher	Edwards	Hoyer
Boyd	Emanuel	Inslie
Brown (OH)	Engel	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Evans	(TX)
Cardoza	Farr	Jefferson
Carson (IN)	Fattah	John
Case	Filner	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Ford	Jones (OH)
Clyburn	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski
Conyers	Frost	Kaptur
Cooper	Gephardt	Kennedy (RI)

Kildee	Miller, George	Scott (GA)
Kilpatrick	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kind	Moore	Serrano
Kleccka	Moran (VA)	Shays
Kucinich	Murtha	Sherman
Lampson	Nadler	Skelton
Langevin	Napolitano	Slaughter
Lantos	Neal (MA)	Smith (WA)
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Snyder
Larson (CT)	Obey	Solis
Lee	Olver	Spratt
Levin	Ortiz	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Stenholm
Lipinski	Pallone	Strickland
Lofgren	Pascarell	Stupak
Lowe	Pastor	Tanner
Lucas (KY)	Payne	Tauscher
Majette	Pelosi	Peterson (MN)
Maloney	Peterson (MS)	Pomeroy
Markey	Pomeroy	Price (NC)
Marshall	Price (NC)	Rahall
Matheson	Rahall	Rangel
Matsui	Rangel	Reyes
McCarthy (MO)	Reyes	Rodriguez
McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Ross
McCollum	Ross	Rothman
McDermott	Rothman	Roybal-Allard
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Rush
McIntyre	Rush	Ryan (OH)
McNulty	Ryan (OH)	Sabo
Meehan	Sabo	Sánchez, Linda
Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	T.
Meeks (NY)	T.	Sanchez, Loretta
Menendez	Sanchez, Loretta	Sanders
Michaud	Sanders	Sandlin
Millender-	Sandlin	Schakowsky
McDonald	Schakowsky	Schiff
Miller (NC)	Schiff	

NAYS—216

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

Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns

Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)

Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick

Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Neu
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner

Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland

Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—19

Ballance
Brady (PA)
Burton (IN)
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Chandler
DeGette

DeMint
Deutsch
Emerson
Fossella
Gerlach
Johnson, Sam
Lynch
Quinn
Ruppersberger
Smith (MI)
Tauzin
Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1252

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. GORDON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 203, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—213

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert

Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake

Foley
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter

NOES—203

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeLahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner

Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse
Hill
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowe
Lucas (KY)
Majette
Macon
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui

McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)

ANABOLIC STEROID CONTROL ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3866, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3866, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 3, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez

Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla

Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp

NOT VOTING—18

Ballance
Brady (PA)
Burton (IN)
Capuano
Carson (OK)
DeGette
DeMint
Deutsch
Emerson
Feeney
Fossella
Gerlach
Johnson, Sam
Lynch
Quinn
Smith (MI)
Tauzin
Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1303

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, I was detained by constituents from my District. I would have voted “no” on H.R. 444.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 656, the texts of H.R. 4409 and H.R. 4411 will be appended to the engrossment of H.R. 444; and H.R. 4409 and H.R. 4411 are laid on the table.

(For texts of H.R. 4409 and H.R. 4411 see proceedings of the House of June 2, 2004, at page H3628 and H3638, respectively.)

Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes

Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud

Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons

Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Viscosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)

Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake
Kucinich
Paul

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews
Ballance
Brady (PA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burton (IN)
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Clyburn
DeGette
DeMint
Deutsch
Emerson
Feeney
Fossella
Gerlach
Hobson
Johnson, Sam
Lynch
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Sabo
Smith (MI)
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1311

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on three roll-call votes earlier today, I was unavoidably detained. I would have voted “nay” on No. 224; on No. 225 I would have voted “aye”; and on No. 226 I would have voted “yea.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 857

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 857.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1261, WORKFORCE REINVESTMENT AND ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1261) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance ac-

countability, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BOEHNER, PETRI, MCKEON, CASTLE, ISAKSON, PORTER, KILDEE, HINOJOSA, AND TIERNEY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

There was no objection.

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

CATHERINE MAY BEDELL, POLITICAL PIONEER AND MENTOR TO WOMEN

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great lady of the Republican Party in the State of Washington. We are so sorry to learn that Catherine May Bedell, our former Member of Congress from the 4th congressional district in Washington State, passed away last Friday.

We lost Catherine May Bedell last Friday. She was a rare lady, Mr. Speaker; and a couple of us wanted to stand up today on the floor and pay tribute to her and let her friends who continue to serve in the House of Representatives and those in politics in Washington State and all over the country know of her passing.

Catherine was born in Yakima. She was one of the few women in national politics at that time to win office on her own, because many people were appointed to replace their husbands or their fathers. Catherine was a strong Member of Congress, a strong woman, very articulate. She had a great time in life, and she stood up for those enterprises that she believed in.

Her political career began in 1952 in Washington State's legislature, and she served as a representative until she was appointed by the party to run against the current Congressman, Otis Halbert, who had decided to retire. She was elected to the Congress in 1958.

Catherine May Bedell was a wonderful spirit, Mr. Speaker. She was somebody who used her talents, being able to speak well, being able to write well, A PR agent, for example, who was hired on by NBC Radio to put together the Betty Crocker specials sponsored by General Mills.

She returned to Yakima before she died. Catherine May Bedell was a great fighter for interests she believed in. She was a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and she fought for the Hanford Nuclear Reserve against people who were trying to close it down. She also was a Member of the House Agriculture Committee, and she

fought for dams to protect those farmers and bargers who operated there in the 4th Congressional District.

□ 1315

The last time I talked to Catherine May Bedell was soon after she left a position on the United States International Trade Commission. She and I met at an event in San Diego, California, where Catherine continued to do what she always did when she saw a woman who had interests in politics. She urged me to run. That was a long time, 11 years before I actually ran for Congress, Mr. Speaker, but when the time came I remembered Catherine May Bedell's words and her encouragement and actually took her up on that bet and let her know through letters and cards how I was doing in the Congress.

So that was my best memory of her, because it has so much to do with the work that I have done here in the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have some folks who have followed her career and would like to say a few words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, Catherine May Bedell was an outstanding member of the House of Representatives. She came from our great State of Washington, from Yakima. She was a graduate of the Yakima Valley Junior College and the University of Washington. She was a noted writer, teacher, journalist and radio broadcaster. In fact, she had the first Betty Crocker radio show in the country.

She was elected, as mentioned, to the legislature in 1952, served to 1958, and then won her first campaign for Congress in the 86th Congress. She served very well on the House Committee on Agriculture, where she was a strong voice for farming, irrigation, hydroelectric power generation across the State's expansive 4th Congressional District.

She served very capably in the House from 1959 through 1970; and, after that, President Nixon appointed her to the U.S. International Trade Commission on which she served for 10 years.

She was a great role model. In fact, she was the first woman elected to the House from the State of Washington.

Many of us in this Chamber today know her son, Jim, who served as the Executive Vice President of the National Association of Broadcasters and today is the President and CEO of the Air Transport Association.

Congresswoman Catherine May Bedell was also survived by a daughter, Melinda May Mazzetti, of San Francisco. I had the honor, when serving on Senator Magnuson's staff as an assistant, to work with her. She was a delight. She was a hard worker. She was a credit to this institution.

We are very sad to learn of her passing. I had a chance to talk to Jim, her son, today; and, of course, the family was very pleased to hear that she would be remembered today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

[From the Yakima-Herald-Republic, Jun. 2, 2004]

CATHERINE MAY, POLITICAL PIONEER AND MENTOR TO WOMEN, DIES

(By Leah Beth Ward)

Yakima native Catherine Dean May, the first woman elected to Congress from Washington, died of natural causes Friday in Rancho Mirage, Calif. She was 90.

May was first elected to the 4th Congressional District in 1958 when Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whom she greatly admired, was president.

Scholars have noted that she was one of the few women in national politics at the time to win office on her own. Many others were appointed to replace their husbands.

"She was very much a pioneer," her son, James C. May, said Tuesday in a telephone interview.

Described as strong and articulate by those who knew her, May inspired and personally encouraged other women to run for political office.

"When I first saw her, she was standing in a group of men and they were listening to her. She could hold her own," said Rep. Mary Skinner, R-Yakima, recalling a Republican Party luncheon more than 30 years ago. "I was a great admirer."

May's political career began in 1952 in the state Legislature, where she served as a representative until the Republican Party nominated her to run for the congressional seat of Otis Halbert, who was retiring. In what was called an upset, she beat Democrat Frank LeRoux of Walla Walla.

May was re-elected to Congress six times until 1970, when she lost to Democrat Mike McCormack, a research scientist at Hanford. That year she remarried, taking Donald W. Bedell's last name.

Born Catherine Dean Barnes on May 18, 1914, she graduated from Yakima High School in 1932 and attended Yakima Valley Junior College through 1934 before earning a bachelor of science degree in 1936 from the University of Washington. May's parents ran a Yakima clothing store.

In 1937 she received a teaching certificate and taught English for three years at Chehalis High School. She interrupted that stint in 1939 to study speech at the University of Southern California, according to her congressional biography.

Her son remembered his mother as very much the English teacher, correcting grammar whenever necessary.

"In my household you grew up watching your language," James May said.

After teaching, May parlayed her language skills into radio broadcasting, first with station KMO in Tacoma, and later stations KOMO and KJR in Seattle. From 1942 to 1944, she worked in advertising for the Strange and Prosser Advertising Agency and the Federal Insurance Co., both of Seattle.

NBC radio of New York City hired her between 1944 and 1946 to produce the first Betty Crocker show, sponsored by General Mills.

May returned to Yakima and continued in radio journalism as "women's editor" at KIT in Yakima from 1948 to 1957.

According to research of her congressional record by Washington State University, upon her election, May was the first representative from the state in six years to win a seat on the House Agriculture Committee. She held the assignment throughout her tenure and used it to fight for dams.

In her last term in office, she received a second committee assignment, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, where she fought an attempt to close Hanford.

Though she never touted herself as a woman's rights activist, May was a quiet champion for the cause. She supported the Equal Rights Amendment and worked to include the prohibition against discrimination based on sex in the landmark 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Political defeat far from ended May's career in public service. President Nixon appointed her to the U.S. International Trade Commission, where she served from 1971-81.

In 1982, President Reagan named her special consultant to the president on the 50 States Project. She was president of her own firm, Bedell Associates, in Palm Desert, Calif.

May's survivors include her son of Washington, DC, and her daughter, Melinda May Mazzetti of San Francisco.

In lieu of flowers, donations may be made to the Catherine May Bedell Scholarship Fund at Yakima Valley Community College.

Six women have represented the State of Washington in the U.S. House of Representatives—Rep. Jennifer Dunn (R) (1993-) Rep. Maria Cantwell (D) (1993-1995); Rep. Julia Butler Hansen (D) (1960-1974); Rep. Catherine Dean May (R) (1959-1971); Rep. Linda Smith (R) (1995-1999) and Rep. Jolene Unsoeld (D) (1989-1993).

[From The Associated Press, June 2, 2004]

CATHERINE MAY BEDELL, FIRST WASHINGTON CONGRESSWOMAN, DEAD AT 90

YAKIMA, Wash. (AP)—Catherine Dean May Bedell, the first woman elected to Congress from Washington state and producer of the first Betty Crocker radio show, is dead at age 90.

Bedell, who was elected to six terms as a Republican in the 4th Congressional District under her married name at the time, Catherine Dean May, before losing to Democrat Mike McCormack in 1970, died of natural causes Friday in Rancho Mirage, Calif., relatives said.

A Yakima native, Bedell was one of the few women to win election to national office in that period without first being appointed to replace their husbands, and many said she inspired and encouraged other women in politics.

State Rep. Mary Skinner, R-Yakima, said she met Bedell at a Republican Party luncheon more than 30 years ago.

"When I first saw her, she was standing in a group of men and they were listening to her. She could hold her own," Skinner said. "I was a great admirer."

Born Catherine Deane Barnes, she earned a bachelor of science degree at the University of Washington, obtained a teaching certificate and taught high school English for three years in Chehalis with a brief but pivotal interruption to study speech at the University of Southern California.

She entered broadcasting in 1940 at KMO Radio in Tacoma, then went to KOMO and KJR in Seattle, spent a couple of years in advertising and was hired by NBC in New York in 1944 as writer and assistant commentator.

After working on the first Betty Crocker show, she returned to Yakima, was women's editor at KIT Radio from 1948 through 1957 and served in the state House from 1952 to 1958, when she was nominated for Congress to replace Otis Halbert, who was retiring.

An Admirer of then-President Dwight D. Eisenhower, she won election in an upset over Democrat Frank LeRoux of Walla Walla in a district that, at the time, covered a vast swath of central Washington from Oregon to British Columbia.

As the first representative from the state in decades to serve on the House Agriculture Committee, she promoted dams for irrigation and electricity production in her rural district. In her last term she was also named to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

She never promoted herself as woman's rights activist but supported the Equal Rights Amendment and worked to include prohibition against discrimination based on gender in the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

She lost the seat to McCormack, a scientist at the Hanford nuclear reservation, in 1970, the same year she remarried and took the last name of her second husband, Donald W. Bedell.

Bedell served on the International Trade Commission in 1971-81, and President Ronald Reagan named her as a special consultant to the president on the 50 States Project in 1982.

At her death she was president of Bedell Associates in Palm Desert, Calif.

Survivors include a son, James C. May, of Washington, D.C. and daughter, Melinda May Mazzetti, of San Francisco.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), of the Fourth Congressional District of Washington State.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I see one of my predecessors from the Fourth District is waiting to speak, too.

I want to congratulate our Members for being here to honor Catherine May Bedell. I regret that I did not know her. She represented the Fourth Congressional District. I did not know her. I knew of her. I did cast ballots for her before I got actively involved in politics. But she was certainly somebody that had leadership qualities.

I recall that in one of the articles announcing that she had passed away, one of my friends serves in the State legislature, Mary Skinner said that she first remembers when she met Catherine May, and she was impressed by the presence that she had in a group of people talking about policy. I thought that was a very high compliment.

I, too, spoke with Jim May. He kind of gave me a heads-up on Tuesday, and I did not touch bases with him until Wednesday when we had a conversation. Catherine May Bedell just turned 90 last month. My mother also just turned 90 last month. He told me that she passed away very quietly in her sleep; and she had a very, very good life. Obviously, when you lose somebody as close as your mother, it is a shock to you, but he said she lived a very, very good life.

I am certainly pleased to be here on the floor with my colleagues to honor one of my predecessors who represented my district in Washington State.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) from the First Congressional District of Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in honoring Catherine May Bedell.

In my role as a previous representative of the Fourth Congressional District, before I was freed by the voters for other duties, as we say, and the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) took that noble office, I did not have the honor of knowing her personally, but I knew her by her legacy. That I think is maybe the nicest, most meaningful legacy a Member of Congress could have. That is when I was door-belling and going to thousands of homes when I was running in Yakima for the seat that she previously held. I had a lot of people, when her name came up, said, I remember her. She was really a nice lady. I really liked her. I heard that a lot.

When you think about a legacy that any of us might have here, I think that is the highest one we could have, that our names may come up when other people are door-belling. She was well loved in Yakima Valley, and we are thinking of her family today. It is an honor to represent her district as well.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in closing, we appreciate the time allotted to us. When a door closes, often another window opens. And to all of us, I want to say that 5 weeks ago a member of my campaign staff gave birth to a little baby girl whose name is Catherine May.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3550, TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3550) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Oberstar moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 3550) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, be instructed to insist on the language contained in section 1101(a)(21)(A) and section 1120(a) of the House bill that establishes and provides funding for a safe routes to school program for the benefit of children in primary and middle schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted we have reached this point. I know that the

point of going to conference and appointing conferees, I know that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) would, as I, have liked to have had this bill on the House floor last fall; and I think we could have. We could well have had this bill enacted by now, and we could well have been on our way to creating 475,000 new jobs and \$80 billion in total economic activity if the committee had been allowed to work its will, as we did in committee. However, other forces intervened; and this is legislative process.

We are where we are now, thank heavens; and we will be able to move ahead and I hope to reach the outcome that we all desire of getting a robust investment in transportation through conference, through the House and the other body and to the President for signature.

I pledge, as I have done from the outset of this process and demonstrated, that we will bend every constructive effort toward that purpose on our side, working in concert with the chair and the majority.

I look forward to a good conference. We have a very good contingent on our side as on the Republican side, and I know that we are all committed together, constructively working to achieve the purpose of a major investment in transportation over the next 6 years.

The motion that I offer instructs the conferees to insist on the innovative Safe Routes to School Program included in the House-passed bill. Innovation but one that has been widely tested, is enormously popular and powerfully supported in more than 26 States across the country since the two pilot projects were undertaken in Marin County, California, and in Arlington, Massachusetts. In Marin County, basically a bicycling to school project and in Arlington, Massachusetts, principally pedestrian activity.

In Safe Routes to School, California, the nine participating elementary schools in the Marin County region that joined in this pilot program went from 2 percent of children walking and bicycling to school to 54 percent today.

This is an enormous vote of support for a healthy life-style, and it is this quality-of-life issue that is a driving force as we move ahead with this transportation bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize this motion to recommit is one I support. It is a motion that will I think make the bill's purposes be specifically spelled out. And I would suggest that what the gentleman, the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) said, this is a working instrument, bipartisan, by all Members of both sides of the aisle who have worked

very long and hard to arrive at a decision and passed a bill which we believe is a very good piece of legislation.

But we requested going to conference. It is because of the differences, as usual, between the Senate and the House, as it should be. It is my hope, with the cooperation we have had in the past, we will be able to talk to the Senate and convince them that we are in the right position at the right time.

I will say, everybody knows where we came from, to begin with, it is a considerable amount of more money than passed the House. The Senate does have more money in the bill, and it is now our job to try to reach a decision to do what is best for this great Nation of ours in our infrastructure.

I have to stress that, and infrastructure is the key to our economy. Infrastructure is what makes all other things work in this legislative body. Without good transportation, we are unable to provide the monies for Medicare, Medicaid, prescription drugs, border patrol, Social Security, all those good things we talked about. The only thing that drives that is infrastructure that makes people and product move. So we believe that we have a good piece of legislation.

On the House side, it passed overwhelmingly, the largest single vote that any Congress has ever voted on a transportation bill. It was done in this House. We had less negative votes than any other time.

And, again, we passed it over to the Senate. They rejected it. We rejected what they sent us, and now it is up to us to ask for this conference. I am hoping that the Senate and House Members will work together, collectively, and we will arrive at a very rapid solution to this very, very important issue to this great Nation.

Again, I want to stress to Members that may be watching in their offices is this is a friendly motion to instruct, one which I support; and if there is a vote, and I expect to ask for a vote, I will ask for a yes vote.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds to extol the labors of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

He has been a constant, solid, secure, wise, counselor as we worked our way through the various provisions of this legislation in the internal negotiations in committee and through the markup; and I look forward to his continued participation as a seasoned hand in the House-Senate Conference on Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines.

□ 1330

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for the time.

I want to stay that I strongly support this motion to instruct. This is an enormously important program. It is one that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, has worked on for a long, long period of time. It is something that I personally am very much interested in, being a cyclist myself; and it is one that I know the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman PETRI) also have supported very strongly, and I appreciate their support.

But in talking about the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman PETRI), I want to once again stress the fact that the product that we have produced out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is a product that the Republicans and the Democrats shared equally in. We worked in concert. We certainly did have some disagreements. There were certainly some things that we did not see eye to eye on, but we resolved those in a very honest, open manner.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) once again for the patience and the persistence that he has demonstrated in moving this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives. I know it has been very difficult for him. There have been many extenuating circumstances that have delayed things, but it certainly was not any fault of his.

I know that if the Senate will be as cooperative, as helpful, as understanding as we in the House have been in putting this legislation together that it should not take long for this conference committee to agree upon a bill to bring back to the House and Senate and to move on to the President so that we can really energize this economy in this country.

There is no more important bill for the economy that this legislative body can deal with than this bill dealing with highways and mass transit in the United States of America. As my favorite President of the 20th century said, this type of bill is a jobs, jobs, jobs bill. We need that in this economy, but we need more ways to move people around, and this is the way to do it.

I thank the gentleman very much for the time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield what time he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, a member of the conference.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished ranking member of our full committee for making this the subject of the motion to instruct conferees, and it is a tribute to not only him but the bipartisan nature in which this committee works to build America's infrastructure, and it continues his vision and the vision of those that worked back

with him in 1991 when they created ISTEA and continued through TEA-21 and now moves forward into TEA-LU in that it recognizes that there needs to be intermodalism and there is more to transportation than just concrete, asphalt and moving people in their automobiles.

The Safe Routes to School program is something that has worked very, very well; and by expanding it to a national level and asking our friends in the Senate in this motion to instruct to accede to the language that we have included in the bill is exactly the right thing to do, and I give the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) a lot of credit for again making this the point that we are talking about today.

It is a great day for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and it is a great day for the Nation that we are moving this process forward. There have been some fits and starts on this bill. We had some differing levels when it came to funding. We had a little tip from the White House over what that funding should be, but only when we get in a conference and are able to talk with our friends and colleagues from the United States Senate about what divides us on the bill and engage the White House can we hopefully convince them that, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) indicated, this is a jobs bill. This bill is critically important to not only relieving congestion; it is important to make sure that men and women in this country are working.

The great thing about working is that these are jobs that cannot be outsourced. There has been a lot of talk about outsource. These are American construction jobs that are going to take place in American cities and American towns all across the country.

So I am very pleased that we are at this stage today, and I want to go back to this motion to instruct to conclude.

Sometimes around here we name things in a way that sounds nice, but they are really not good programs. That is not the case with Safe Routes to School. It is a good program, and it deserves our support; and I hope we are able to convince our friends in the Senate to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me begin my remarks by thanking both the chairman and our ranking member for such a cooperative spirit in this committee; and it is appreciated by, I am certain, Members on both sides of the aisle.

I rise in strong support of the Oberstar motion to instruct conferees to accept the Safe Routes to School program as included in H.R. 3550. The House version outlines a stronger, more flexible program than the Senate version. The House version will provide much-needed funding for infrastructure improvement and safety initiatives, ensure that States receive no less than

\$2 million a year, and would improve the ability of kids to safely and conveniently get to school by walking or biking.

In my home State of Texas, the requests for funding for this popular initiative have been overwhelming, with request amounts far exceeding our current budget amounts.

So I urge my colleagues to address the congestion around our Nation's schools and provide increased physical fitness opportunities for kids by supporting this motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The inspiration for this initiative in this legislation was a report by the Centers For Disease Control of the U.S. Public Health Service, the Department of Health and Human Services some 4 years ago. I participated in this conference and listened to the presentation that over 300,000 Americans a year die of obesity and its complications, the second-leading cause of death in America. Yet 25 percent of America's 15-and-under school children are clinically obese; 36 percent of all Americans are obese or are seriously clinically overweight. We are facing a health epidemic that 75 percent of children 15 and under do not walk, do not bicycle to school or associated activities; they are driven. That is a class in our society that is mobility challenged.

I heard these numbers and others that I will not repeat here that just show an emerging health crisis with huge implications for obesity, for cardiovascular disease, stroke, diabetes, and other related illnesses.

The Centers For Disease Control raised the flag. I thought we ought to have a response. I gathered together a group of active-living organizations, those bicycling and pedestrian and other outdoor activities, cited those figures and said I have got an idea to deal with this: we will call it Safe Routes to School, to engage an entire generation of Americans in a healthier lifestyle that will follow them throughout their life. That is a wave throughout society that is starting with elementary school age children. They will carry this all through their young life into adulthood and pass it on to their children.

With that, I persuaded the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to commit \$50,000 in grants to the Marin County schools and another similar grant to honor Arlington County schools in Boston, and the project was under way. It has been an enormous success, widely imitated throughout the country, widely supported. This is a lifestyle change.

We get an opportunity to do something like this once in a career in the Congress. I greatly appreciate the support of the chairman of the full committee; the chairman of the sub-

committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI); the kind words of the gentleman from Ohio; my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI); and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) has given us strong, vigorous, unflagging, unfailing leadership in moving this legislation from the time we conceived the bill to the time we introduced the bill to the time we moved it through committee. It was his persistence, his insistence and vision of investing in America, creating jobs, moving America forward, restoring our economic vitality, meeting congestion head-on, investing in the future of America at the base of our economy, to stimulate the whole economy. We will need that continued visionary, strong, forceful leadership as we go into conference with the differences that are considerable between the two versions of this legislation.

It is my hope that TEA-LU will prevail in policy and that we may move closer to the other body's version in investment and that at another date, after we get this enacted, we will come back and do the real bill at the \$375 billion level that we all know is needed to move America forward.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments the gentleman has made, and he knows this has been a joint effort. The gentleman has worked well with us, and I can assure him that we are on the same page; and as we go to conference, there will be some differences of opinion, but I think if we stand shoulder to shoulder, our policy will prevail.

Now our problem is to try to get the money to take and implement that policy, and that is going to be our responsibility, and I think we can do it. I am very positive about it. I always have been, always will be because it is the right thing to do, and we will continue our efforts; and I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has had a positive, upbeat attitude from the outset; and that is what it is going to take to get us through the coming weeks.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 655.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 377, nays 30, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

YEAS—377

Abercrombie	Davis (CA)	Holden
Ackerman	Davis (FL)	Holt
Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Honda
Akin	Davis (TN)	Hooley (OR)
Alexander	Davis, Jo Ann	Hostettler
Allen	Davis, Tom	Houghton
Andrews	DeFazio	Hoyer
Baca	Delahunt	Hulshof
Bachus	DeLauro	Hunter
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Inslée
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Israel
Baldwin	Dicks	Issa
Ballenger	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Barton (TX)	Dooley (CA)	(TX)
Bass	Doollittle	Johnson (CT)
Beauprez	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Becerra	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Bell	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Bereuter	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Berkley	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Berman	Engel	Kaptur
Berry	English	Keller
Biggart	Eshoo	Kelly
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Kennedy (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Bishop (NY)	Everett	Kildee
Blumenauer	Farr	Kilpatrick
Boehlert	Fattah	Kind
Boehner	Feeney	King (IA)
Bono	Ferguson	King (NY)
Boozman	Filner	Kirk
Boswell	Foley	Klecza
Boucher	Forbes	Kline
Boyd	Ford	Knollenberg
Bradley (NH)	Fossella	Kolbe
Brady (TX)	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Brown (OH)	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Brown (SC)	Frost	Lampson
Brown, Corrine	Galleghy	Langevin
Brown-Waite,	Garrett (NJ)	Lantos
Ginny	Gephardt	Larsen (WA)
Burgess	Gibbons	Larson (CT)
Burns	Gilchrest	Latham
Burr	Gillmor	LaTourette
Buyer	Gingrey	Leach
Calvert	Gonzalez	Lee
Camp	Goode	Levin
Capito	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Capps	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Cardoza	Granger	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Graves	LoBiondo
Carter	Green (TX)	Loftgren
Case	Green (WI)	Lowe
Castle	Greenwood	Lucas (KY)
Chabot	Grijalva	Lucas (OK)
Chandler	Gutierrez	Majette
Chocoma	Gutknecht	Maloney
Clay	Hall	Manzullo
Clyburn	Harman	Markey
Coble	Harris	Marshall
Cole	Hart	Matheson
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Cooper	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (MO)
Costello	Hayes	McCarthy (NY)
Cox	Hefley	McCollum
Cramer	Hensarling	McCotter
Crane	Herger	McCrary
Crenshaw	Herseth	McDermott
Crowley	Hill	McGovern
Cubin	Hinchey	McHugh
Cummings	Hinojosa	McIntyre
Cunningham	Hobson	McKeon
Davis (AL)	Hoefel	McNulty

Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Nunes
Nussie
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter

Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—30

Barrett (SC)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonilla
Bonner
Cannon
Cantor
Culberson
DeLay

Flake
Franks (AZ)
Hayworth
Hoekstra
Hyde
Isakson
Kingston
Linder
Miller (FL)
Myrick

Northup
Norwood
Royce
Schrock
Shadegg
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiberi
Toomey
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—27

Ballance
Brady (PA)
Burton (IN)
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Collins
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeMint

Deutsch
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Gerlach
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John

Johnson, Sam
Lynch
McInnis
Obey
Quinn
Scott (VA)
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1406

Messrs. TIBERI, CULBERSON, LINDER, DELAY, ROYCE, CANTOR, TANCREDO, BONNER, FRANKS of Arizona, ISAKSON, BARRETT of South Carolina, BISHOP of Utah, HAYWORTH, SCHROCK, HOEKSTRA, TOOMEY, Mrs. NORTHUP and Mrs. BLACKBURN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WELLER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING THE CRACKDOWN ON DEMOCRACY PROTESTORS IN TIANANMEN SQUARE, BEIJING, IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THAT TRAGIC MASSACRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 655.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 655, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]
YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps

Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson

Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee

Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussie
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shimkus
Shimwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—33

Ballance
Ballenger
Brady (PA)
Burton (IN)
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Collins
Cramer
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeMint

Deutsch
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Gerlach
Houghton
Hunter
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Lewis (CA)

Lynch
Marshall
McInnis
Obey
Olver
Otter
Quinn
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Tauzin
Wilson (SC)

□ 1414

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 227 and 228. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 227 and 228.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons I had to return to my District in Indiana and I was therefore unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, and 228.

Had I been here I would have voted "aye" for rollcall vote 223, "no" for rollcall vote 224, "aye" for rollcall vote 225, "aye" for rollcall vote 226, "aye" for rollcall vote 227, and "aye" for rollcall vote 228.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote 227, on Motion to Instruct Conferees on Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (H.R. 3550); rollcall vote 228, condemning the crackdown on democracy protesters in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, in the People's Republic of China on the 15th anniversary of that tragic massacre (H. Res. 655).

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall votes 227 and 228.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3550, TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill (except title IX) and the Senate amendment (except title V), and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, PETRI, BOEHLERT, COBLE, DUNCAN, MICA, HOEKSTRA, EHLERS, BACHUS, LATOURETTE, GARY G. MILLER of California, REHBERG, BEAUPREZ, OBERSTAR, RAHALL, LIPINSKI, DEFazio, COSTELLO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of sections 8001-8003 of the House bill, and title VI of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. NUSSLE, SHAYS, and SPRATT.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 1602 and 3030 of the House bill, and sections 1306, 3013, 3032, and 4632 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of provisions of the House bill and Senate amendment relating to Clean Air Act provisions of transportation planning contained in section 6001 of the House bill, and sections 3005 and 3006 of the Senate amendment; and sections 1202, 1824, 1828, and 5203 of the House bill, and sections 1501, 1511, 1522, 1610-1619, 3016, 3023, 4108, 4151, 4152, 4155-4159, 4162, 4172, 4173, 4424, 4481, 4482, 4484, 4662, 8001, and 8002 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BARTON of Texas, PICKERING and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Government Reform, for consideration of section 1802 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, SCHROCK, and WAXMAN.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 1105, 1207, 1602, 1812, 2011, 3023, 4105, 4108, 4201, 4202, 4204, 5209, 5501, 6001, 6002, 7012, 7019-7022, and 7024 of the House bill, and sections 1512, 1513, 1802, 3006, 3022, 3030, 4104, 4110, 4174, 4226, 4231, 4234, 4265, 4307, 4308, 4315, 4424, 4432, 4440-4442, 4445, 4447, 4462, 4463, 4633, and 4661 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, SMITH of Texas, and CONYERS.

□ 1415

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 1117, 3021, 6002, and 6003 of the House bill, and sections 1501, 1502, 1505, 1511, 1514, 1601, 1603, 3041, and 4521 through 4528 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. POMBO, GIBBONS and KIND.

From the Committee on Rules, for consideration of sections 8004 and 8005 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DREIER, SESSIONS and FROST.

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 2001, 3013, 3015, 3034, 4112, and Title V of the House bill, and Title II, sections 3014, 3015, 3037, 4102, 4104, 4237, and 4461 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GILCHREST, NEUGEBAUER and GORDON.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of Title IX of the House bill, and Title V of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THOMAS, MCCRERY and RANGEL.

For consideration of the House bill and Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DELAY.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture:

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective today, June 3rd, 2004, I hereby resign from the Committee on Agriculture.

Sincerely,

MIKE THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 661) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 661

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

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Ms. Herseth (to rank immediately after Mr. Marshall).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader about the schedule for the week to come.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of this week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, we plan to consider several bills that respond to the urgent demand for national action on energy policy: The Arctic Coastal Plain Domestic Security and Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Reform Act, The Renewable Energy Project Siting Improvement Act, The Energy Policy Act, The Energy Science Act and The U.S. Refinery Revitalization Act.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for that information.

First, if I can ask the leader, there are not bill numbers on the energy packages to which the gentleman referred. Have these bills been introduced, are there going to be hearings held on them, have hearings been held on them, will they be considered by committee? Can the gentleman fill us in on some of that information?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the bills are being worked on as we speak. We anticipate many of them being introduced today, if not today, tomorrow. Most of the bills have already been considered or voted on in the past on energy policies. We do not anticipate the need for any committee action on many of these bills. Some of them are suspension-type bills, and we anticipate bringing some on suspension calendar and then others by rule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Let me clarify: Have some of these bills passed in perhaps the larger energy bill? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. So the gentleman is taking segments out of that bill to put in separate pieces of legislation?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we are taking some of the bills and issues out of the House-passed energy bill that did not find their way into the conference report that is pending before the Senate that the House has already passed. So the major piece of legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2004, is a restatement of the energy conference report that is pending in the Senate, the ANWR AML bill. There are amendments against ANWR that have failed, but we have had votes on ANWR in this House in the debate on the energy bill leaving the House. The U.S. refinery revitalization bill is a bill that we anticipate being on suspension. The ANWR AML bill will be under rule.

Mr. HOYER. All right, that is the Arctic Coastal Plan Domestic Energy Security and Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Reform Act?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct. That is what we call the ANWR AML bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman anticipates some of these may be introduced today. When would Members be able to have copies of these bills to review, and have these bills been reviewed by the minority on the committees of jurisdiction?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not privy to the work done by the relevant committees, the most relevant committees, the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, as to what they have done or not done with the minority, but as far as the gentleman's question on when Members will be able to see those bills, obviously, as soon as they are introduced, they will be available.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. Hopefully we will have an opportunity so that our Members, certainly on the committees of jurisdiction on the minority side, will have an opportunity to review them and advise our side of the aisle at least their views on those, in light of the fact they are not going to be considered in committee and some will be on suspension. Others will go to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, that is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

The FSC bill, there has been a lot of talk about the FSC bill. Can the leader tell me when we might anticipate a FSC bill being on the floor or being marked up in committee?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, as we are doing this colloquy, the Speaker is contemplating how we can accommodate the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means who is going with the Speaker over the weekend for the D-Day celebration. I think we have at least tentatively worked out a schedule whereby the Committee on Ways and Means could do their markup on Wednesday or Thursday and have the bill on the floor the first of the week following.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader. I want to, on behalf of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), state our appreciation for that consideration. It is my understanding the gentleman is going to Normandy with the Speaker and they will not return until approximately 5 or so Tuesday afternoon, so that meeting at 6 o'clock would have been difficult. We appreciate the consideration that has been given.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, I might also add that the jobs bill contemplated by the chairman will probably be introduced by tomorrow. So Members will have at least over the weekend a chance to look at the bill before the markup of the committee.

Mr. HOYER. You say the jobs bill; the American Jobs Creation Act?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct. Some people refer to that as FSC.

Mr. HOYER. I see what the gentleman is saying. It is one and the same.

Where are those jobs, Mr. Leader?

Mr. DELAY. They are all in that bill, thousands upon thousands of them.

Mr. HOYER. Actually, I meant are they overseas or here in America?

Mr. DELAY. We are bringing them home, Mr. Whip.

Mr. HOYER. I presume that will be part of our debate, Mr. Leader.

Mr. Leader, lastly, the budget enforcement bill, is that going to be on the calendar at any time soon?

Mr. DELAY. As the gentleman knows, in March the Committee on the Budget passed a bill that would extend statutory pay-as-you-go rules on new mandatory spending to ensure that new programs are offset by spending

reductions. In addition, the bill would instate statutory spending caps on statutory programs. Now that the House has passed the budget resolution conference report, we look forward to quick consideration of this bill.

We have a very busy schedule planned for next week. We had planned on bringing this bill up next week and still may do so. But we may not be able to consider this bill next week; and, therefore, we most probably would schedule it for the following week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. As the gentleman knows, I am sure both sides of the aisle feel that is a critical piece of legislation, in light of the deficits that are confronting us, as to how we can get those under control. I know there are differences of opinion on that, but I know on our side of the aisle we believe that that is a very important step for us to take in light of the budget deficits.

Lastly, Mr. Leader, if I can ask the leader, it was I think tentatively believed that we would be meeting next Friday. In light of the accommodation on the FSC or jobs bill, would Members be correct in thinking that Friday of next week may not be a legislative day?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, that is very difficult to say. We do have a very ambitious schedule for next week. It could very likely take Friday to complete that schedule. However, we are going to work as hard as we can to get our work done as soon as we can; and, if we can get our work done, we may not have to work on Friday. But I would warn the Members that it is very possible that we would have to be here on Friday.

□ 1430

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for his information.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4478), to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act

of 1958 through July 23, 2004, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, the legislation we are about to pass is necessary because the House still has not gotten its work done on the reauthorization of the Small Business Administration. H.R. 4478 represents the fourth extension since the Committee on Small Business unanimously passed bipartisan legislation almost a year ago, and yet the House leadership continues to block its consideration.

I am reluctantly agreeing to this because, while the legislation does extend the SBA until the end of July, it fails to address the critical needs of the 7(a) and 504 loans programs.

We need to bring the SBA reauthorization, H.R. 2802, to the floor and give small businesses the access they need to important contracting, loan, and technical assistance programs.

I hope that we do not have another extension and empty promises of action.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4478

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

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

The authorization for any program, authority, or provision, including any pilot program, that was extended through June 4, 2004, by section 1 of Public Law 108-217 is further extended through July 23, 2004, under the same terms and conditions.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 2 of Public Law 108-205 is amended by striking "October 1, 2003" and inserting "March 15, 2004". The amendment made by the preceding sentence shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the section to which it relates.

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

REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR TURKMENISTAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-189)

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 and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (the "Act"), as amended, with respect to the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to Turkmenistan. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue this waiver for a further 12-month period and includes my determination that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for Turkmenistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act, and my reasons for such determination.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 2004.

REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-190)

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 and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (the "Act"), as amended, with respect to the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to the Republic of Belarus. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue this waiver for a further 12-month period and includes my determination that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act, and my reasons for such determination.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 2004.

REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR VIETNAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-191)

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 and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (the "Act"), as amended, with respect to the continuation of a waiver of application of sub-

sections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to Vietnam. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue in effect this waiver for a further 12-month period and includes my determination that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for Vietnam will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act and my reasons for such determination.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 2004.

**HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY,
JUNE 4, 2004**

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 2004.

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

There was no objection.

ENRON TRADERS PLOT MARKET RIGGING

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I happen to represent a great and wonderful community, Houston, Texas. But in that community is a company called Enron. And I watched during the 2 or 3 years past when 5,000 employees were laid off, through no fault of their own, and through some of the crumbling and outrageous behavior of some of those now before the justice system.

But I come to condemn the outrageous comments made by Enron employees that really have no place in any part of corporate America.

As the words go: "So the rumor is true that they are taking all of the 'blank' money back from you guys; all that money you stole from those poor grandmothers in California?"

Response: "Yeah, Grandma Millie, man, she's the one who could not figure out how to 'blank' vote on the butterfly ballot."

Trader: "Now she wants her 'blank' money back for all the power you jammed up her 'blank' for \$250 megawatts an hour."

Let me ask corporate America to establish a code of conduct. This is outrageous. This should be condemned, and I hope they get their due justice. This does not reflect hard-working employees who every day get up and try to do their job.

**BIPARTISAN AMERICAN VISION
FOR LEADERSHIP IN SPACE**

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

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, there are some enormous issues that face America today, but something is lost, as we talk about the challenges in the war on terror and the President's leadership in Iraq and, of course, finally, the strongly recovering economy under President Bush's leadership, is the President's space vision for tomorrow.

It becomes important that we pay attention to the great things that the President has proposed. For the first time really in 2 decades, we have a new space vision to guarantee that America will continue to be the predominant space leader through the next millennium, as it has been over the last 50 years. It is important that we return the Shuttle to flight; it is important that we complete the international space station. But more importantly, the President has given us a new vision so that we can explore mid-Earth orbit and outer-Earth orbit.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Sean O'Keefe is doing a wonderful job. I hope this House will be able to focus in the next 5 months and after the election on a bipartisan American vision for leadership in space. The President's vision is affordable, it is visionary, it is flexible; and, most important, it will maintain America's leadership in space.

NEW DIRECTION IN AMERICA FOR JOBS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bush came to northeast Ohio, Youngstown, last week to try to defend an economic program that simply is not working in any of the Great Lakes industrial States. Ohio has lost one out of six manufacturing jobs since President Bush took office. We have lost almost 200 jobs every single day of the Bush administration.

His answer to that is more tax cuts for the rich, hoping they trickle down and create some sort of economic activity, and more trade agreements like NAFTA that continue to ship jobs overseas. Those policies are not working.

What we should be doing is extending unemployment benefits to the 50,000 Ohio workers who have lost their benefits. We should reexamine these trade agreements. We should pass the bipartisan Crane-Rangel bill which gives companies incentives to manufacture in the United States, rather than giving tax breaks to the largest companies in the country which continue to outsource and continue to ship jobs overseas. That policy is not working.

We need a new direction in Ohio and across the country.

FAREWELL TO PAGES

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this is the longest 1-minute that we will see on the House floor in a year, and this is the annual farewell to our pages who have served us so well this last year. I would like to ask the page class of 2003-2004 to come on down to the well of the Chamber. Come on. Come on down, and find a place in the first two rows here.

Well, here we are. It is a special time. As you finalize your activities today on the floor and you go through your graduation tomorrow and you get loaded up, first of all, thanks. Thanks for serving us. Thanks for serving your country. We are going to miss you.

As chairman of the House Page Board, it is my privilege to acknowledge and thank this outstanding group of young men and women. Today marks your last day of service in the 2004 page class. You are starting another phase of your life, and all of these phases of life always continue. New phases, new challenges.

While today is the ending of the page experience, it is the beginning of a multitude of opportunities that may not even be revealed to you yet. Universities and careers, travels and adventures, families and friends all lie on the horizon for each one of you.

It is true that whenever one door closes, another one opens. Go boldly through each new door that presents itself during the course of your life and embrace the challenge that the world puts in front of you with the same vigor and expertise and the commitment to work that you have shown here on the floor.

We really are proud of you. You have had an insider's view that a lot of people would pay a lot of money for. As many of you know, part of my West Point experience was leadership; it is a leadership school. What we teach at West Point is that there are good examples of leadership and there are bad examples of leadership, and take the good and remember the bad and try not to replicate the bad.

As you have seen, a multitude of things happened in this last year, I challenge you to do the same thing. Look at the good qualities of the Members and the staff, not just the page program staff, from the dorm to the school, to here on the floor, but also your interaction with Members of Congress, your interaction with their staffs. Take the good. Remember that. Use that to help mold you into the kind of adult you want to be. But also remember the bad experiences, how maybe some of you saw the treatment of other individuals that you did not really think was right or proper, and use that and commit yourself to say, that is not going to be me when I am an adult. That is part of the learning and growing experience.

I am going to be able to interject as we have a chance to share, but I want to yield now to the ranking member of the Page Board, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a man who has

been involved with this program, I would like to say forever, although he may not agree with that.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all of the pages who have served so diligently here in the 108th Congress. We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the U.S. House of Representatives operate. You come from across the Nation. You represent what is good about our country.

To become a page, you have had to prove yourselves to be academically qualified. You have ventured away from the security of your homes and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. But through this experience, you have witnessed a new culture; you have made new friends and learned the details of how government operates. And you have seen Congress at its best and sometimes at its worst. We are human beings, but this is the greatest democracy in the world.

As we all know, the job of congressional page is not an easy one, and no one knows that more than you. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance the competing demands for their time and their energy. In addition, you must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people on a personal level; from the powerful to everyone. You have had to deal with people, and I am very proud of how you have dealt with them.

At the same time, you face a challenging academic schedule of classes in the House page school. I am sure that you will consider your time spent here in Washington, DC, to be one of the most valuable and exciting experiences of your lives. With that experience, you will move ahead and lead successful and productive lives.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt back in the mid-1930s uttered these words, but they are as relevant today as they were during those very difficult times. He said, "There is a strange cycle in human events. To some generations, much is given. Of other generations, much is expected."

This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

□ 1445

And having met all of you and seen you at work, I am confident that you will meet the challenges of that rendezvous.

Mr. Speaker, as the Democratic member of the House Page Board, appointed by Speaker Tip O'Neill. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans. I am personally proud of you. I have benefited from you. I think we all add to one another. You added to my experiences. You have presented to me a challenge to do better. And when you go back home, you will have had a special experience that no one else will have had.

There is a great program in this country called Close Up. It is a great

program, and I always meet with all my Close Up students. But no one has seen this government as close up as you. When you go back home, you will have every opportunity to talk about government and how, despite the faults and shortcomings, this is a great body and this is the greatest democracy in the world. And you are one of the reasons it is.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I will submit for the RECORD the names of the class of 2003–2004.

2003–2004 PAGES

REPUBLICANS

Rebecca Ball—WA, Manfred Bekeris—AK, Ryan Bieshaar—CO, Daniel Boden—CA, Anthony Bonna—FL, Clinton Brown—MO, Diamond Bruner—VA, Tiffany Cannon—GA, and Michael Capovilla—NV.

Tom Church—MI (Camp), Dominique Clay—MI, Michael Dennis—PA, Jenna Douglass—DE, Andy Duberstein—VA, Chris Fitzwater—CO, Patrick Fortune—CA, Andrew Gall—PA, and Tim George—MD.

Andrea Hall—KY, Clay Hammock—SD, Katelyn Hancock—IN, Weston Jones—SC, Clara Kang—CA, Jenna Kelsey—NJ, Craig Kreinbihl—OH, Carolina Krohne—FL, and Allison Kushner—NY.

Nicholas Lane—AR, Matthew Mazzetta—IL, Elizabeth McCune—TX, Rachael McMullan—NC, Matthew Merighi—NJ, James Orlando—NY, Sarah Reed—WY, Liesel Rickhoff—TX, and Ashley Rubenstein—WV.

Taylor St. Claire—AZ, Michael Sala—PA, Rebecca Sher—TX, Kara Skarda—NC, Nicholas Smith—MI, Katherine Souza—CA, Lynda Thorne—GA, Nicholas Vorpapel—WI, and Christine Wright—CO.

DEMOCRATS

Clarice Bennett—IL, Kathryn Byerly—KS, Joseph Carliner—MD, Melissa Eddy—NC, Alexander Gates—PA, Omar Halabi—OH, Demetrius Harrison—IL, and Ian Herron—Cary—IN.

Corinna Holden—VT, David Horvath—MA, Sarah Johnson—WI, Frances Mercedes—NY, David Miller—CA, Monica Ramos—CA, Jennifer Ridder—CO, and Mallory Scarritt—FL.

Samantha Shinberg—DC, Alison Shott—PA, Mary Swick—PA, Maza Menasche-Untemeyer—FL, Jeffrey Waters—NY, Brian Wright—MN, and Blake Yocum—IA.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the Minority Whip of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has always been very, very supportive of the program and very gracious with his time to come down on the floor.

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

I thank all of you for participating in this program. It is important for America that you do so. You have gotten, obviously, something from this program, perhaps a great deal, but, in my opinion, America is getting more from this program.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who has served on this board for longer than any other Member and with whom I served on the board for a short period of time, observed that you have been given a unique privilege, an insight into democracy that few Americans get. They see us on C-SPAN, they read about us in the newspaper, they

see short clips, the 30 seconds or the 15 seconds, but you know better than almost all of your colleagues, your peers, that that 30-second clip is not necessarily the truth of what happens.

You have seen firsthand the dedication of Members. You have seen firsthand, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) pointed out, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) has as well, that those of us who have the great honor and privilege of serving here are just like you but a little older.

You are all different. You have different points of view. I am sure you have had discussions about some of the issues that you have heard debated on this floor. You have seen that in your own peer group that you differ, and that, in fact, probably each of you reflects to some degree some of the sentiment expressed on this floor and you agree with that. And you will find the gal sitting next to you say that, no, I do not agree with that; I think X was right and not Y.

That is the glory of our democracy, that we have created an institution in which the different points of view can come together and be discussed and be debated. You have seen that sometimes that debate becomes relatively heated and passionate, and it is because the issues discussed on this floor are very important and impact on all of us, but on you particularly, because you will live longer under the policies that we adopt today than the rest of us, at least on average.

You have been given a special opportunity, and I would hope that you would feel that that comes with a particular responsibility. One of the concerns that those of us who are older have is that those of you who are younger do not participate in very high levels, at least in percentages, of impacting on the decisions we make in our democracy. The way most citizens impact on those decisions is, obviously, through voting in elections. Young people, as all of you know, do not vote at a very high percentage. That is of concern.

I want to read you something that was said by an Englishman. He said, "We live in an age when to be young and to be indifferent can be no longer synonymous." Think of that. "To be young and indifferent," he said, can no longer be synonymous. We must prepare for the coming hour. The claims of the future are represented by suffering millions; and the youth of a nation are the trustees of prosperity."

That was said by a gentleman who was the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Benjamin Disraeli. He said that in 1845. It is true today. It is true, in fact, as, again, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) pointed out, in every generation.

We had a dedication to perhaps some of your grandfathers, the World War II Memorial, and perhaps your grandmothers as well who were called by Tom Brokaw the Greatest Generation. But, in fact, as Roosevelt indicated and

as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) pointed out, every generation is called upon to make its contribution.

In some generations, the challenge is greater than it is in others. In World War II, we lost 60 million people in the world. 60 million. 407,000 Americans killed in that war. We are engaged in another war today in your generation and in my generation, a war on terrorism. It calls upon a lot of young people and some middle-aged people, your parents' age, perhaps, in the Reserve or National Guard, to be deployed overseas, to confront those who would undermine our democracy and our security and our safety. And very soon, very, very soon, you will be called upon to be on the front line, perhaps not overseas but here certainly.

So I would ask you to take from this House, from this well and this room that we call the People's House, to which one can only come by election, we just had a debate on that this week that you will recall, and I hope that you will go back and you will talk to your friends, perhaps your brothers and your sisters, your schoolmates, your peers, and tell them what you have seen.

My experience has been that when I was president of the Maryland Senate, and we had a page program there, was that invariably those who were pages in the Senate, and my experience has been here with pages who have served in this House, that you leave with a more positive view than when you came. That does not mean that you have a rose-colored version of the House of Representatives. It is, after all, peopled by, as I said, people like you, with some strengths, some weaknesses, some faults and some extraordinarily good points.

So I urge all of you to return to your schools, return to your homes, return to your communities and spread the word about the fact that democracy works, that your participation makes a difference, and that in the final analysis, if democracy is to work well, if it is to work as our Founding Fathers conceived it, it will be because we all participate.

Good luck and God bless you. Thank you very much for your service.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, now I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), who, as many of you know, has been very involved in following your progress and lack thereof throughout this year, to address you all.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first, let us all give each other a round of applause for a very, very successful year here in Congress.

The first time you have actually been able to sit in the seats of Members on Congress and be on national TV. Congratulations. You really are living in a unique time in our country.

I think my colleagues have well expressed the sentiments all of us having

watched you arrive one day as very young and excited newcomers to Washington, some with fear in your eyes because you have left friends and family, others with a sense of optimism and pride that you are getting to represent your districts from around this country.

It is fun to watch the transformation from that first day to the last week. Because I see in all of you that sense of kind of reluctance to some degree to leave this place. You have met and have established lifelong friends in this very process.

What is exciting for all of us that serve here is that you truly represent the best and brightest in this country. It is very, very difficult, as you know, to become a page in the Congress. It requires a number of skill sets that will serve you in life: leadership, intelligence, personality, perseverance, and faith; and those are attributes that, as you mature and go forward in life, will serve you in phenomenal ways.

Many of you know that several Members of Congress originated in the page class. So it is not only a training and testing ground. You certainly got a long exposure to the good and bad Congress has to offer. The good is the fact that in this democracy, in this Chamber, we get to express our opinions about what goes on in the world. We get to weigh in on behalf of the district that I represent and the other Members represent, those 600-plus thousand people who count on us to come to this Nation's Capital every day to work on their behalf.

Disagreements are the joy of democracy. You get to argue and discuss and debate and create hopeful solutions that do not reflect the partisan views of the people in this Chamber but reflect the views of all Americans.

Now, I know you have one more year of high school to conclude and that probably is some degree of relief or maybe, to those you feel like you are probably well equipped to enter your first year of college, some of you, I think, in conversing with you, some are actually mature enough to enter college right away.

I want to thank you for taking time out of your life. This is a sacrifice. It is unique.

I know my page Anthony was, and is, expected to deliver the commencement speech. So a word of warning, Anthony, the 16th district is watching you very carefully.

This Member of Congress, of course, is delighted that there is an age requirement to run for the job. He lives in my community, and he certainly has to reach 25 before he campaigns for this job.

But congratulations on behalf of our district, our mutual district that you have been selected by your peers to have this high honor; and I will be looking for transcripts of that speech.

Anthony came here as a page on the recommendation of several in our community. It was kind of interesting to

watch this little mini-campaign take place and those friends that he had in the northern part of my community urging and cajoling and talking to me about submitting his name to be a page. Of course, for those Members of Congress, we get to submit names, but, ultimately, it is the choice of the Page Board and the Speaker of the House that bestows on you this high honor. So you are, in essence, the Speaker's appointment.

Take with you the valuable knowledge you have gained. Never forget your friends. Stay in touch. The interesting thing is that, years from now, as you look around the country and you have your page reunions, you will see each and every one of you doing something unique and different.

□ 1500

Hopefully, some of you will be going on to better communities by being teachers, police officers, firefighters, members of the military, nurses, veterans, whatever your chosen profession. A few may go on to be Congressmen, Congresswomen, Governors, Senators. In fact, in this very room may be the future President of the United States. God bless you. I wish you well, have a great life, and thank you for your service to this Congress.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his chance to share with you.

Did he not mention that maybe it might be your high privilege and honor to be the chairman of the Page Board some year? He always leaves that off. I do not know why that is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), who has a great history in education as a superintendent of schools, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

To all of you, let me thank you. As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) has shared with you, prior to my coming to Washington, I had the distinct privilege of being the State superintendent of schools for the State of North Carolina. I consider that a high privilege because I got to work with wonderful young folks like you every day. And I was seated back there looking at the backs of your heads and said, I really want to see your faces because I have seen you in here from day to day.

I want to associate myself with my colleagues' comments. I may repeat some of them, and I will be brief, but I do not want to. The truth is as they have said, and Lord knows how many commencement speeches I have made and groups I have spoken to, you are the future. You will move on the stage very quickly. And you will finish the work. It may be here in this Chamber or in the State legislative chamber or as a doctor, lawyer, preacher, teacher, whatever it may be. You will finish the work that others have started. And always remember that.

I think it is good to remember that there are new ideas from time to time, and we have breakthroughs, but the greatest contributions are made by those who are willing to keep their hands on the steady plow, as we say in rural North Carolina, and you plow a straight furrow. In other words, you do the right thing. You were made out of the right stuff, and we are awful proud of you.

I only wish that every student in America could have the same experiences that you have had for the last number of weeks you have been here. We would have a lot better country because they would go home with a different understanding of Washington, DC.

I started to ask for a show of hands, but I will not do it, of how many of you when you came to Washington, this was the first time you had ever been to Washington. And if that is not true, this would be the first class we have had that that is not true of. For some of you, it may be the very first time you have been away from home for an extended period of time. You have adapted and adjusted to that.

All of us can remember when we went away to camp for the first time, and a week is a long time, and you have been gone for a week and you have adapted well. You brought your school books with you. You were not sure how in the world you were going to handle all of that, right? But you did and you did a heck of a job, and we are proud of you.

You have already shown that you can achieve before you came and you have added to that knowledge. So let me thank you for coming. I have full confidence in whatever you choose to do you will do well because you have already done well.

Let me say to Melissa Eddy, who is from my congressional district, the Second District of North Carolina, we are proud of you. We are glad to have you here this week. And for all of you as you leave this week, including you, Melissa, when you leave here tomorrow and when you head home, you are going to get a little vacation probably. And depending on whether you are going to college or back to high school, it is going to be a short summer because some schools start pretty quick, college and otherwise.

This has already been shared with you, but I want to share it with you again, that is, if you have not gotten everyone's mailing addresses and their known numbers and e-mails, get it and keep it. Your paths will cross again, sometime sooner than you think.

Stay in touch. There are not many places you will ever go again in your life that you will spend and share the time you have shared one with another, with people all across America from virtually every State and have the opportunity to share ideas, whether you agree or disagree and have the kind of positive discourse and great understanding and learning you have had here.

Have a safe trip home. Have a great summer. God bless all of you because you are special, special folks. I wish you all the luck in the world in whatever you choose to do.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) to come up as he wants to address the group. This is a perfect example. The gentleman and I are very good friends. We do not agree very much on about anything, but one thing we agree on is the service that you all conduct and the honor of this institution and the hard work that everybody puts into it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS). I know you really want to listen to one more speech because you have not heard enough speeches since you have been here.

It is a pleasure to be here. I particularly thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for their good work; to Wren, to all of your supervisors, your new supervisor, Joy Malleen, and to all of you especially for your public service at a very young age.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) says this is an almost 200-year tradition of pages working in the greatest legislative body in the world, and this is an achievement you can look back on. It is an achievement especially because if you are like Omar Halabi in my district, if you are like most people here, I think, it was not by accident you ended up here. You are obviously achievers at home. Many of you went through a competitive process to get here. You obviously have shown self-discipline; you are self-starters. You already have the kinds of values and the kind of work ethic that will get you ahead as you go off to college, and you go off in to the military and you go off into the workforce.

I have watched Omar from Brecksville, Ohio, in my district and watched some others of you and talked to you, for some of you it is a semester, for others as Omar got to re-up as they say. I have gotten to see the personal growth and the kind of growing into the whole idea of public service.

My short remarks, I will just say that I hope when you go home, I heard the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) talking about young people not registering to vote in very high numbers. I hope you will go home, those of you that are 18 now or soon will be 18 or have plenty of friends that are 18, that you make it your mission to register your friends to vote, to get involved, whichever side you want to be on in the Presidential race this year, whichever side you want to be on on any number of political campaigns at home in community service and encourage people, as President Theodore Roosevelt, my favorite Republican

said, "Get in the arena. That is where you really make a difference."

You have already been in the arena by working in this legislative body, by serving the Congress, by serving your country. You can accelerate that and go home and build on that and really be in the arena every day, back at school, back in the workplace, in the military, at home doing what you already know how to do. You have the leadership skills. You have the interpersonal skills. I hope that you will share those skills with people all over the 50 States of this country and get into the arena and do it.

Congratulations to all of you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to send my regards for the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), who has visited with many of you. He is receiving an award down at the EPA. I know he is trying to get back here on time, but it looks like he will not. As you know, he has been very close to the program. He will get a chance to extend his remarks.

To whom much is given, much is expected. And I think that is really is summary of what the Members who have come on the floor have attempted to say in their own way. We thank you for your service. We have all bled a little bit this year. We have all sweated a little bit this year. We have all cried a little bit this year, not only the pages but of course, of course, the dorm staff, the school staff, the floor staff. Make sure you go and tell them to thank the adult supervision folks who have been so patient to get us through this year.

Again, from the House of Representatives, from the Speaker, from the minority leader, thank you for your service. Have a great graduation tomorrow. May God bless you all, and may God bless the United States of America. You are now dismissed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Farewell to the Pages 1-minute speech.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in recognizing the Congressional Pages that will be ending their term of service this week. I would also like to commend Congressman SHIMKUS and Peggy Sampson for all of their hard work.

The House Pages have made up the critically important support staff that has kept the House floor running smoothly for over 200 years.

The 2003–2004 full-school year Pages were selected from hundreds of applicants, following an incredibly competitive process that scrutinizes their individual achievements in academics, leadership, and commitment to social and civic service.

Page duties include delivering all types of correspondence and legislative materials throughout the Capitol and House Office Build-

ings, answering phones in the Members' Cloakrooms, relaying messages, flying flags over the Capitol, and preparing the House floor for session.

These pages have spent their entire junior year of high school in Washington, D.C., living, taking classes and working for the House.

The typical day of a Page begins very early at 5:45 am or 6:00 am to eat breakfast prior to attending classes for school at 6:45 am. At 10:00 am, their legislative workday begins and lasts until the House adjourns in the evening; and sometimes into the early morning hour.

These individuals have demonstrated their true commitment to playing an important role in our Nation's future by learning and working in the nation's capitol.

We honor those Pages that have shown the same generosity of spirit, depth of intelligence, and capacity for human service that is so important to leaders.

These exceptional students have consistently displayed their dedication, intelligence and concern throughout their time as a Page in Congress. They stand out among their peers not only because of their many achievements, but also the disciplined manner in which they meet all challenges. Although they have already accomplished a great deal, these young people possess unlimited potential.

The House Pages are young men and women of character, ambition, and initiative, who have made a significant contribution to the United States House of Representatives and already learned well the value of hard work and commitment. Their efforts and dedication is very much appreciated and our best wishes bestowed upon them in all of their future endeavors that I am sure for some will include elected office including Congress. I suspect all will be leaders.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, we extend our thanks and highest praise and congratulations to each Congressional Page.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the

time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

There was no objection.

CONFUSING MEDICARE CARD GAME

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, this week America's seniors and disabled Americans can use the new prescription drug discount card created by last year's Republican Medicare law. This card program has not exactly been met with a resounding "yes." Nationwide fewer than 500,000 seniors out of 40 million actively chose to enroll in the card.

A little surprise when seniors in Ohio and throughout the country have found it confusing, have found it overwhelming, have found it way, way too bureaucratic, and have found it unreliable.

Under traditional Medicare, all of your benefits are available through one Medicare card that looks like this. But under the new program, seniors have to choose from a whole deck of cards. This card may be a discount for Fosamax. This card may be a discount for Zoloft. This card may be a discount for Vioxx. This card may be a discount for Lipitor. This card might be a 12 percent discount. This card might be a 16 percent discount. This card might be a 19 percent discount.

But even with that confusion, Mr. Speaker, it gets worse because one card might cover your blood pressure medicine but not your heart medicine; the discounts published in the brochure you read, the 12 percent, the 14 percent, the 16 percent, the discounts you might read could be out of date by the time you get to the drug store.

In other words, under this Rube Goldberg kind of plan, you pick one of these, in Ohio, 53 cards, you pick one of these cards, you pay \$30, you are stuck with that card the whole year. Yet, the card maker, the card seller can change the discount, can change the drugs that are covered anytime during that 52 weeks. Mr. Speaker, that is not Medicare. This is Medicare. It is simple. It is reliable. It is universal.

The new program is having such problems that even one of its most widely accepted provisions is having trouble signing people up. The new law provides annual subsidies of up to \$600, a good idea, on drug purchases for some, unfortunately too limited, number of low-income seniors.

□ 1515

But even that provision did not reach its target audience. Secretary Tommy Thompson says he is somewhat concerned that low-income seniors are not signing up. A lot of us are concerned in

this House that they are not signing up.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and I have introduced a bill that would automatically enroll all seniors in the new low-income subsidies program.

Like Medicare itself, our proposal is simple; it is universal and reliable. Unfortunately, because it violates the Republican privatization way of doing things, they do not want to do it. So instead of actually fixing the problem by saying all seniors who are eligible get the \$600 automatically, the Bush administration's going to spend another \$4 million to advertise to try to encourage people to sign up. They have already spent up to \$80 million to tell seniors that this program is a good idea overall. Now they want to spend another \$4 million doing something that we ought to do to reach out to those seniors that need the drug benefit.

Earlier last year when the HHS auditors said the Republican bill would cost \$134 billion more than the White House said, the White House suppressed the estimate and gagged the auditor. When the initial reaction from seniors was less than enthusiastic, the Bush administration announced plans to spend, as I said earlier, \$80 million of our taxpayer dollars to educate seniors on why this bill is not really this bad after all. When news coverage of the program was not favorable enough, the Bush administration was undaunted. They just rolled out their own news stories, at taxpayers' expense, complete with fake anchor, phony interviewer, bogus reporter. It is not about substance; it is about image.

I think we can show that we can do better. House Republican leadership should pass the Dingell bill this week. It would begin to enroll those people who are eligible for the \$600 drug benefit, those lower-income seniors. We could pass it and get it over to the other body in plenty of time to have it on President Bush's desk by next week. I would love that to happen.

The choice, Mr. Speaker, again should be do we want one Medicare card that can give good drug discounts using the 40 million beneficiaries to negotiate a 40, 50, 60 percent discount for all seniors on this one card, or do we want to issue this privatized kind of Medicare with 53 cards, with 53 different plans, sold by private insurance, too confusing, too bureaucratic, and, frankly, a benefit that is barely worth it?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SAME OLD, SAME OLD

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the more things change, the more they stay the same. Our allegiances to our allies and friends change constantly. For decades, exiled Iraqi Ahmed Chalabi was our chosen leader to be in the new Iraq. Championed by Pentagon neocons and objected to by the State Department, Mr. Chalabi received more than \$100 million U.S. taxpayer dollars as our man designated to be the leader of a new Iraqi government.

But something happened on the way to the coronation. The State Department finally won out in its struggle with the Pentagon to dump Chalabi and his Iraqi National Congress, delivering Iraq to a competing exiled group.

What a mess. No one should be surprised. Regime changes, whether by the CIA or by preemptive war, almost always go badly. American involvement in installing the Shah of Iran in the 1950s, killing Diem in South Vietnam in the 1960s, helping Osama bin Laden against the Soviets in the 1980s, assisting Saddam Hussein against Iran in the 1980s, propping up dictators in many Arab countries, and supporting the destruction of the Palestinian people all have had serious repercussions on American interests including the loss of American life. We have wasted hundreds of billions of dollars while the wounds in the Middle East continue to fester.

How many times have our friends become our enemies and our enemies our friends, making it difficult to determine which is which? Our new relationship with Qaddafi in Libya is an example of the silliness of this policy. Long-term interference in the internal affairs of other nations does not help us or those we support.

The invisible economic costs are enormous, but generally ignored. A policy of militarism and constant war has huge dollar costs, which contributes to the huge deficits, higher interest rates, inflation and economic dislocations. War cannot raise the standard of living for the average American. Participants in the military industrial complex do benefit, however.

The clear failure of the policy of foreign interventionism followed by our leaders for more than a hundred years should prompt a reassessment of our philosophy. Tactical changes, or relying on the U.N., will not solve these problems. Either way, the burden will fall on the American taxpayer and the American soldier.

The day is fast approaching when we no longer will be able to afford this burden. Currently, foreign governments are willing to loan us the money needed to finance our current account deficit and, indirectly, the cost of our

worldwide military operations. It may seem possible now because we have been afforded the historically unique privilege of printing the world's reserve currency.

Foreigners so far have been only too willing to take our depreciating dollars for their goods. Economic law eventually will limit our ability to live off others by credit creation; and trust in the dollar will be diminished, if not destroyed. Those who hold these trillion-plus dollars can hold us hostage if it ever becomes in their interest. It may be that economic law and the hostility toward the United States will combine to precipitate an emotionally charged rejection of the dollar.

That is when the true wealth of the country will become self-evident, and we will no longer be able to afford the extravagant expense of pursuing an American empire. No nation has ever been able to finance excessive foreign entanglements and domestic entitlements through printing-press money and borrowing from abroad.

It is time we reconsider the advice of the Founding Fathers and the guidelines of the Constitution, which counsels a foreign policy of nonintervention and strategic independence. Setting a good example is a far better way to spread American ideals than through force of arms. Trading with nations, without interference by international government regulators, is superior to sanctions and tariffs that too often plant the seeds of war.

The principle of self-determination should be permitted for all nations and all demographically defined groups. The world tolerated the breakup of the ruthless Soviet and Yugoslavian systems rather well, even as certain national and ethnic groups demanded self-determination and independence.

This principle is the source of the solution for Iraq.

Instead of the incessant chant about us forcing democracy on others, why not read our history and see how 13 nations joined together to form a loose-knit republic with emphasis on local self-government. Part of the problem with our effort to reorder Iraq is that the best solution is something we have essentially rejected here in the United States. It would make a lot more sense to concentrate on rebuilding our Republic, emphasizing the principles of private property, free markets, trade and personal liberty here at home rather than pursuing war abroad. If this were done, we would not be a militaristic state spending ourselves into bankruptcy, and government benefits to the untold thousands of corporations and special interests would be denied.

True defense is diminished when money and energy are consumed by activities outside the scope of specifically protecting our national interests. Diverting resources away from defense and the protection of our borders, while antagonizing so many around the world, would actually serve to expose

us to greater danger from more determined enemies.

A policy of nonintervention and strategic independence is the course we should take if we are serious about peace and prosperity. Liberty works.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the gentleman from Oregon's (Mr. DeFAZIO) time.

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

There was no objection.

THE INCOMPETENCE MUST STOP

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, sadly I am here to talk about what we cannot ignore: the sad, sad chronicle of incompetence and blunder which marks this administration's conduct of national security policy.

I do not think in the history of the United States there has been a major national security effort handled so badly. I voted against the war in Iraq. I voted for the war in Afghanistan, and I am glad I did. I voted against the war in Iraq because I did not think it was justified, and I feel vindicated in that judgment; but even for those who thought it was justified, I do not understand how they can fail to join in the criticism of the shambles this administration has made of the policy.

I will insert in the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, an article by Elisabeth Bumiller from the May 29 New York Times, and the headline is "Conservative Allies Take Chalabi Case to the White House."

[From the New York Times, May 29, 2004]

CONSERVATIVE ALLIES TAKE CHALABI CASE TO THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Elisabeth Bumiller)

WASHINGTON, May 28—Influential outside advisers to the Bush administration who support the Iraqi exile leader Ahmad Chalabi are pressing the White House to stop what one has called a "smear campaign," against Mr. Chalabi, whose Baghdad home and offices were ransacked last week in an American-supported raid.

Last Saturday, several of these Chalabi supporters said, a small delegation of them marched into the West Wing office of Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, to complain about the administration's abrupt change of heart about Mr. Chalabi and to register their concerns about the course of the war in Iraq. The group in-

cluded Richard N. Perle, the former chairman of a Pentagon advisory group, and R. James Woolsey, director of central intelligence under President Bill Clinton.

Members of the group, who had requested the meeting, told Ms. Rice that they were incensed at what they view as the vilification of Mr. Chalabi, a favorite of conservatives who is now central to an F.B.I. investigation into who in the American government might have given him highly classified information that he is suspected of turning over to Iran.

Mr. Chalabi has denied that he provided Iran with any classified information.

The session with Ms. Rice was one sign of the turmoil that Mr. Chalabi's travails have produced within an influential corner of Washington, where Mr. Chalabi is still seen as a potential leader of Iraq.

"There is a smear campaign under way, and it is being perpetrated by the C.I.A. and the D.I.A. and a gaggle of former intelligence officers who have succeeded in planting these stories, which are accepted with hardly any scrutiny," Mr. Perle, a leading conservative, said in an interview.

Mr. Perle, referring to both the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, said the campaign against Mr. Chalabi was "an outrageous abuse of power" by United States government officials in Washington and Baghdad.

"I'm talking about Jerry Bremer, for one," Mr. Perle said, referring to L. Paul Bremer III, the top American administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority in charge of the occupation of Iraq. "I don't know who gave these orders, but there is no question that the C.P.A. was involved."

In Baghdad, coalition authorities vigorously denied Mr. Perle's assertion. "Jerry Bremer didn't initiate the investigation," Dan Senior, the spokesman for the Coalition Provisional Authority, said in a telephone interview.

Similarly, Mark Mansfield, a C.I.A. spokesman, called Mr. Perle's accusation that the agency was smearing Mr. Chalabi "absurd." A Defense Department official who asked not to be named said that Mr. Perle's accusations against the D.I.A. had no foundation.

Mr. Chalabi has been a divisive figure for years in Washington, where top Pentagon officials favored him as a future leader of Iraq and top State Department officials distrusted him as unreliable. Either way, Mr. Chalabi and his exile group, the Iraqi National Congress, fed intelligence to the Bush administration about Iraq's unconventional weapons that helped drive the administration toward war.

Intelligence officials now argue that some of the intelligence was fabricated, and that Mr. Chalabi's motives were to push the United States into toppling Saddam Hussein and pave the way for his installation as Iraqi's new leader.

Although Mr. Chalabi's supporters outside the administration have been caustic in their comments about his treatment, there has been relative silence so far from Mr. Chalabi's supporters within the administration. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul D. Wolfowitz, who favored going to war in Iraq and was a patron of Mr. Chalabi, did not respond to numerous requests this week for an interview.

Mr. Wolfowitz's spokesman, Charley Cooper, said in an e-mail message that Mr. Wolfowitz believed that Mr. Chalabi and the Iraqi National Congress "have provided valuable operational intelligence to our military forces in Iraq, which has helped save American lives." Mr. Cooper added in the message that "Secretary Wolfowitz hopes that the events of the last few weeks haven't undermined that."

The current views of Vice President Dick Cheney and his chief of staff, I. Lewis Libby,

are not known. Both strongly supported Mr. Chalabi before and during the war in Iraq.

Last Saturday, participants in the meeting with Ms. Rice and her deputy, Stephen Hadley, said Ms. Rice told them she appreciated that they had made their views known. But she gave no hint of her own opinion, participants said, and made no concessions to their point of view.

Newt Gingrich, the former speaker of the House of Representatives, also attended the meeting. A larger meeting later that day, with Mr. Hadley alone, included Danielle Pletka, a vice president of the American Enterprise Institute, a research institution in Washington.

In an interview, Ms. Pletka said that Mr. Chalabi had been "shoddily" treated and that C.I.A. and State Department people had been fighting "a rear guard" action against him.

"They've been out to get him for a long time," Ms. Pletka said. "And to be fair, he has done things and the people around him have done things that have made it easier for them. He is a prickly, difficult person and he drives them crazy. He never takes no for an answer, even when he should."

Ms. Pletka added: "There are questionable people around him—I don't know how close—who have been involved in questionable activities in Iraq. He is close to the Iranian government. And so all of these things have lent credence to the accusations against him."

Mr. Perle said the action against Mr. Chalabi would burnish his anti-American credentials in Iraq and possibly help him to be elected to political office. "In that regard, this clumsy and outrageous assault on him will only improve his prospects," Mr. Perle said.

Mr. Perle said that he had no business dealings with Mr. Chalabi, but that he believed the C.I.A. and D.I.A. were spreading false information that he did. He also said that Mr. Chalabi was not alone in supplying intelligence to the United States government that turned out to be false.

"I know of no inaccurate information that was supplied uniquely by anyone brought to us by the Iraqi National Congress," Mr. Perle said.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chalabi, if I am pronouncing it right, people will remember, is the man who we had thought was someone the President approved of, whom the President now tells us he cannot quite remember.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, as an aside, that probably we should be investigating Chamber security here because apparently at the last State of the Union address a man largely unknown to the President managed to seat himself next to the First Lady. Mr. Chalabi was seated next to Laura Bush. Now the President has no idea or only a vague idea who this man is; and when a stranger, apparently a stranger of some disrepute, if we listen to the White House, is allowed to seat himself next to Laura Bush, then I begin to feel nervous. In general, I think the people who run security do a very good job, I do not know, and this point probably was not their fault. They may have been misled by somebody in the Defense Department, but we better look into it.

We now go back to the spectacle of this administration's internal warfare. We read recently that the Secretary of State was very angry at the CIA be-

cause he now acknowledges that they gave him misinformation. I do not know if that is one of the reasons that the director of the CIA resigned. He is the man who, of course, told the President that it was a slam dunk that there were weapons of mass destruction. Apparently, he slammed when he should have dunked, and he is no longer with us, but the chaos continues.

Here we have in this story the conservative allies, according to Mr. Richard Perle, who is a close adviser to the Defense Department, and according to this article last Saturday, several of these Chalabi supporters said a small delegation of them marched into the West Wing of Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, to complain about the administration. For some of these people, who have been consistent advocates of war, marching into Condoleezza Rice, it was the only marching they ever did because certainly they have not been in uniform to march in any wartime conditions, but we have them denouncing the Bush administration, Bush advisers denouncing Bush advisers.

Mr. Powell was quoted in the New York Times last Sunday, well, big surprise, "we disagree with each other." That is not the problem. It is not a problem that the President's advisers disagree with each other. The problem is that the President appears to agree with each of them who disagree with each other. The President does not solve these problems. We have had this ongoing dispute. It is extraordinary to have someone being paid \$40 million or more by the American Government, supported by the Defense Department, Mr. Chalabi, then overthrown by the State Department or the CIA.

Here is Mr. Perle, again, a close ally of the Defense Department, remember the Defense Advisory Board, saying there is a smear campaign under way being perpetrated by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. This is Mr. Perle, and then he denounces Mr. Bremer. We are told you, Democrats, do not be critical of the people in Iraq who are running our policy, you will undermine them.

I am nicer than Mr. Perle to these people. Mr. Perle is being much more vitriolic, and he has even managed, Mr. Perle, because he is the epitome of niceness, to find a way to defend Mr. Chalabi who we are now told by this government may have leaked important information to the Iranians.

Here is Mr. Perle's defense of Mr. Chalabi, and Mr. Perle is a man who chooses his words carefully. I wish he chose his friends as carefully as he chose his words, but he does choose his words carefully; and here is what he said about Mr. Chalabi's organization, the Iraqi National Congress, from the New York Times of last Saturday: "I know of no inaccurate information that was supplied uniquely by anyone brought to us by the Iraqi National Congress," Mr. Perle said."

In other words, he does not deny that Mr. Chalabi lied to us. He does not

deny that Mr. Chalabi in effect boasted he gave us misinformation and does not mind that it could help us go to war. His point is that Mr. Chalabi was not the only one who lied to us. I do not think it is much of a defense of Mr. Chalabi to say he is the only one who lied to us, nor does it say much for this administration that they listened to so many liars. The incompetence must stop.

□ 1530

GRAVE SHORTFALLS IN NATO'S INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FORCE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to inform our colleagues about grave shortfalls in NATO's International Security Assistance Force, ISAF, in Afghanistan and about efforts to ensure the mission has the resources needed for success.

This Member returned to Washington yesterday from Bratislava, Slovakia, where the spring session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly was held. This Member serves as the President of the Assembly, which for the last 50 years has served as the parliamentary adviser and support organization for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO.

The inability of the Alliance to meet its commitments in Afghanistan was the most important issue we discussed in Bratislava. This Member cannot overstate how critical the next few weeks will be for the future of Afghanistan and for the credibility of NATO.

Several members of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly visited Afghanistan on behalf of the Assembly 2 weeks ago. They were unanimous in their praise for the professionalism of our soldiers but were equally convinced that, without additional resources, the Alliance faces failure in Afghanistan and risks losing all that it has currently invested.

The problems, as noted by those members, relate to the unwillingness of Alliance member countries to provide the personnel and the key air assets required to deploy additional provincial reconstruction teams, or PRTs, to provide security beyond Kabul and the surrounding environs.

In addition, the allies must provide ISAF with the extra forces needed to give the forthcoming elections the best chance of success. This is a matter of great urgency. If our allies do not commit more forces and the support assets to sustain them in the next 4 to 6 weeks, the September elections in Afghanistan will likely do little more than to legitimize the warlords and drug traffickers who are increasingly controlling much of the country.

In Bratislava, Alliance legislators urged our respective governments to examine carefully what further assets they can individually commit. We recognize, of course, that many NATO countries, like our own, already deploy substantial numbers of forces in Afghanistan and elsewhere. The United States currently has about 13,500 military personnel in and around Afghanistan, most in conjunction with Operation Enduring Freedom, the separate mission to fight the Taliban and al Qaeda in southeastern Afghan. Germany and Canada are the two largest contributors to ISAF, with about 1,800 troops each. But Canada's year-long commitment ends in August, and its forces must be replaced from elsewhere.

Compared with the total resources the Alliance can call on, the numbers needed now are not great. Their likely impact, however, is crucial. Time is not on our side. Excuses will not suffice. We must secure those assets now. To fail to do so will place in jeopardy all we have achieved thus far in improving stability in this crucial region.

Actually, this is a failure of political will, pure and simple. Make no mistake about it, this is a failure that jeopardizes the success of our mission in Afghanistan and jeopardizes the very credibility of the Alliance.

We often say that failure is not an option. Mr. Speaker, in Afghanistan, failure is a distinct possibility. And unless allied leaders in the next few weeks demonstrate the political will to deploy the necessary assets in Afghanistan, failure gradually will become a reality.

Drastic shortfalls exist despite the fact there are more than 2 million military personnel in the active and reserve forces of the European NATO allies. Less than 2 percent of those forces are deployed in missions in the Balkans and Afghanistan.

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, the Secretary General of NATO, has stated repeatedly that the credibility of the Alliance is at stake in Afghanistan and so, it should be emphasized, is the future of the Afghan people.

Recognizing this reality, the leaders of all 26 NATO allies' parliamentary delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly, in an extraordinary, unprecedented step, authorized this Member to send a letter to all the heads of government of the NATO countries forthrightly expressing the concerns of the Assembly.

That letter strongly urges governments to provide the necessary resources for the NATO missions in Afghanistan and the fervent hope that effective action can be taken quickly and the necessary forces provided.

In addition, we agreed to raise this concern in our respective national legislatures in order to generate the widest possible parliamentary support for the required resources to be made available.

NATO already has made remarkable progress in Afghanistan and, with a lit-

tle more effort, our goal of bringing peace and stability to that troubled country is achievable.

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

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

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

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

HONORING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce two pieces of legislation in this House that recognizes and honors the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces throughout the history of our great Nation.

The first bill is H.R. 4425, called the Honor Our Fallen Prisoners of War Act. Currently, prisoners of war who die during their imprisonment of wounds inflicted in war are eligible for a posthumous Purple Heart recognition. However, those who die of starvation, for example, or beatings or freezing to death are causes which are not eligible for the Purple Heart.

Can this be right? There should be no false distinction indicating more courage or more sacrifice by some who died and less by others. All POWs who died in service to our Nation should be eligible for this Purple Heart recognition, and H.R. 4425 will allow all members of our armed forces who die while a prisoner of war, regardless of the cause of death, to be awarded this honor. This will apply to all wars, past and present.

I am indebted to Rick and Brenda Morgan Tavares of Campo, California, and to Wilbert "Shorty" Estabrook of Murrieta, California, who brought this issue to my attention. Shorty survived the Tiger Camp death march during the Korean War and was imprisoned for over 3 years. Brenda's uncle, Corporal Melvin Morgan, died of starvation and beatings he suffered in 1950 at the age of 20 in Korea. Surely Corporal Morgan is deserving of a Purple Heart.

I am also introducing H. Con. Res. 434, a resolution to commend all persons who were inducted for service in the United States Armed Forces during World War II. I repeat, inducted into service. This is a particularly fitting time for such recognition. We all witnessed last Saturday the World War II Memorial on the Mall in Washington, DC, being dedicated as a lasting symbol

of our Nation's appreciation of these veterans. We are also approaching the 60th anniversary of D-Day on June 6, 2004, when tens of thousands of inductees, or draftees as they are usually called, were among the Allied Forces invaded Normandy, France.

To provide a bit of history, the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was enacted 1 year after Germany invaded Poland, and the number of men to be inducted into the Armed Forces was increased 5 days after the United States entered World War II in December of 1941. Of the over 16 million uniformed personnel serving during World War II, 10 million were draftees. They distinguished themselves in war and peace, as we know, and Tom Brokaw has called them "America's Greatest Generation."

The Blinded Veterans Association of San Diego, California, and its President William Montgomery have asked for my help in gaining national recognition for the draftees in our Armed Forces, and I am honored to do so today. H. Con. Res. 434 commends the millions who were inducted during World War II and who served with great courage to advance the cause of freedom throughout this world.

Taken together, these two pieces of legislation remind us of the gift of freedom that we have been given through the service and sacrifice of men and women who came before us. I urge my colleagues to support both H.R. 4425 and H. Con. Res. 434.

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

ON THE RETIREMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL F. GJEDE

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Brigadier General Michael F. Gjede on his service to the United States of America. After more than 35 years in the Air Force, General Gjede will be retiring, and we in northeast Ohio have been very privileged to have him as the Commander of the Air Force Reserve 910th Airlift Wing at Youngstown Air Reserve Station in Vienna, Ohio.

A graduate of Northeastern University in Boston, General Gjede earned his commission through the Air Force Officer Training School program in 1968. Once he had earned his wings, he served two tours in Vietnam flying B-52s and logging over 140 combat missions.

General Gjede has held numerous command positions in the Air Force,

and the 910th is the second flying wing that has had the opportunity to have him as their commanding officer. As our wing commander at the Youngstown Air Reserve Station, General Gjede's personal involvement, his encouragement, and intuitiveness have produced an overwhelming response, as recognized in the achievements of the wing's members.

The 910th's functional areas performed flawlessly, despite a stressful and turbulent atmosphere caused by the events of September 11, 2001. His superior leadership was the driving force that kept all personnel properly focused, allowing them to consistently meet and exceed requirements. Despite the challenges of the most aggressive reserve operations tempo in history, the 910th immediately responded to the homeland defense initiatives in support of Operation Noble Eagle and the worldwide requirements for Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

General Gjede's continual involvement in base renovation and new construction projects, operation and maintenance facilities, and quality of life projects will produce benefits far into the future. The accomplishments of General Gjede culminate a long and distinguished career in the service of his country and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

On a personal note, one of the unique experiences I have had with General Gjede was an opportunity to participate in the Youngstown Air Reserve parachute program. It is not really a program. It is a simulation of parachuting. General Gjede gave me an opportunity to put on the suit, strap myself in, and look down and do the virtual reality and try to land on a carrier. Well, needless to say, I had my suit pants on, so General Gjede got to see me with suit pants, a tie, and the equipment necessary for parachuting dangling from the ceiling at the air base and missing the boat completely and going directly into the water. I do not even believe I got the parachute out in time. So General Gjede has seen his Congressman in some very compromising positions. Luckily, there was no one in there with a camera to take any pictures.

So that was a good experience I have had, among many, with General Gjede; and he is going to be sorely missed.

But I would also like to say that behind every great man is a great woman. He has a phenomenal wife, Jerylynn, who we have had the opportunity, my wife Julie and I have had the opportunity to get to know. She is a tremendous, tremendous woman. She is a great First Lady for the 910th. She has an enormous amount of class and composure and brought a lot of elegance to the air base, and we will sorely miss her as well.

So on behalf of the people of the 17th Congressional District, I want to thank you, General Gjede and your wife, and wish you and your family the best.

On a personal note, I have enjoyed our time together, our dinners together, and hope that in the future there will be many, many, many more. We are definitely wishing and hoping that you will stick around in our community after your retirement, because our community certainly is a better place and a stronger place with you and Jerylynn in it, and we will not just miss the General and his wife but we will miss our friends.

So I wish you the best of luck and hope that we get to see you in our community and look forward to many, many, many further experiences together on behalf of the air base.

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

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

THE CHALABI DEBACLE

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I stand here today beside this picture. On the right is President George W. Bush and on the left of the picture is a man by the name of Chalabi, Mr. Chalabi. We have heard a lot about Chalabi in recent days. The President, apparently, indicated recently that he did not know him well, that he may have met him at a rope line. But the fact is that Mr. Chalabi was in this Chamber as the honored guest of the President of the United States, seated right up there near the President's wife, Laura Bush. He was applauded by those gathered in this Chamber.

We now know that Mr. Chalabi, who we have reason to believe was paid some \$40 million by this government, until just recently, those payments were finally, belatedly, cut off, but Mr. Chalabi was supposed to be providing intelligence to this administration. He is especially, apparently, close to Vice President CHENEY and to others within this administration.

□ 1545

Based in part on intelligence data that came from Mr. Chalabi, this administration made a decision to go to war. Think about that. What have we learned in recent days about Mr. Chalabi. Well, according to news reports, not only was the information that he gave us distorted, false, and in some cases apparently made up; but we now have news reports, credible news reports that Mr. Chalabi was cooperating with one of the axis of evil nations, that nation being Iran.

According to news reports, this government had broken the code that en-

abled us to intercept communications from the nation of Iran and that Mr. Chalabi told Iran that our government had in fact broken their code. News reports say that Mr. Chalabi further informed the Iranian Government that he received that information from someone within the United States Government who was drunk at the time.

If these reports are accurate, it means that our troops and our national security have been placed at greater risk because this administration put its confidence in this man. Not only did we give him our national resources in terms of about \$40 million, not only was he invited to the State of the Union, allowed to sit near the First Lady and receive the adulation of this body, not only was he given these millions of dollars in this recognition, but we depended upon the information coming from this man; and now it appears that our national security may have been compromised.

Mr. Speaker, there needs to be a thorough investigation of what has happened here. We need to find out if our young men and women have been put in harm's way because of the actions of this man; and the President needs to explain to us why he now indicates he knows little about Mr. Chalabi, when he is here in this picture, he was invited to this Chamber for the State of the Union address, and this government invested more than \$40 million into this man.

This is something that cries out for explanation and investigation, and it is my hope that the President will accept the responsibility of making sure that the news reports of the last few hours are thoroughly investigated, that all those responsible for the possible leaks regarding national security issues are identified and are thoroughly, utterly, totally discredited.

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

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

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1964, President Lyndon Johnson declared a war on poverty. Yet today, 40 years later, millions of Americans continue to face poverty and hunger. It's unconscionable that in the 21st century, in the richest and most prosperous country in the world, nearly 35 million Americans—13 million of them children—go hungry every day.

Today is National Hunger Awareness Day. This initiative, sponsored by America's Second Harvest, is designed to help raise public

awareness about hunger and the problems faced by millions of people who are having trouble feeding themselves and their families. Today, thousands of hunger relief advocates and volunteers will work with food banks, food-rescue organizations and agencies to help raise awareness about hunger in their communities.

Madam Speaker, the statistics are astounding. Nearly 35 million Americans go hungry each year. 13 million are children. In 2002, over 34 million Americans and 7.2 million American families lived in poverty. The problem of hunger is getting worse, not better. The percentage of households experiencing food insecurity increased from 10.7 percent in 2001 to 11.1 percent in 2002.

Hunger and food insecurity don't fit the old stereotypes of the poor and uneducated. Not only are more working families relying on food banks for help to feed their children, but over 62 percent of recipients of food from food banks have at least a high school diploma. This is intolerable. As a nation, we should not and can not continue to have lower-income families struggle to earn enough money to put food on the table. Poverty and hunger are directly related—if you don't have money, you can't buy food. It's that simple.

This year's theme for Hunger Awareness Day is "One Big Table." Hundreds of events are taking place around the country, and I would like to highlight one taking place in my district.

Today, the Worcester County Food Bank is holding a "Picnic and Food Drive Kick-Off." The Worcester County Food Bank, together with Sovereign Bank, Shaw's Supermarkets, the Worcester Telegram & Gazette, WSRS/WTAG Radio and Curry Printing, are kicking-off the 2nd Annual County-wide Grocery Bag Food Drive. Held at the Worcester County Food Bank, the event includes food drive sponsors, partner agencies, volunteers and staff enjoying a picnic lunch prepared by Community Kitchen student chefs. It will feature on-air radio interviews with the sponsors and agencies to raise awareness of the local hunger problem and promote the upcoming food drive.

Madam Speaker, National Hunger Awareness Day is just one day out of the year when individuals, companies, organizations, and faith-based groups can participate, but the reality is that hunger is a political problem. There is no justification for hunger to exist in this country, or around the world, for that matter. We have the food, the money, and the manpower to end hunger in the United States. What we can't seem to find is the political will to do so.

Earlier this year, this body approved bipartisan legislation reauthorizing the child nutrition programs. It's a good bill that, sadly, doesn't go far enough. For example, over 22 million low-income children participate in the free and reduced-price school breakfast and lunch program. However, only 4.7 million children receive these same lunches in the summer—a 78.8 percent drop in participation. And it's not for lack of need. No, Madam Speaker, it's from the lack of commitment by this Congress.

In another example, Madam Speaker, the Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act rightly ends the requirement that many families must pay a reduced price for breakfasts and lunches. But instead of ending this required payment now, the House-passed bill phases it out over five years.

Madam Speaker, we must do better. The Education and Workforce Committee crafted a good, bipartisan bill. It's a good start, but it must be improved. The programs to end hunger are in place. They don't need to be recreated; they just need to be fully funded. The American people deserve better, and, on National Hunger Awareness Day, I urge my colleagues in the other body to pass a broader, more inclusive Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act.

Madam Speaker, let me close by commending America's Second Harvest, the food banks around the country, the corporations, faith-based groups, volunteers and other anti-hunger advocates for their hard work and dedication to end hunger in the U.S. Today is National Hunger Awareness Day. But these individuals and groups work to end hunger every day. Food bank participation continues to rise. The need for anti-hunger programs is clear. I, for one, am grateful for America's Second Harvest's commitment to ending hunger in America. I urge my colleagues to make every day Hunger Awareness Day, to commit themselves to ending hunger in any way they can, and to find the political will to end the scourge of hunger here at home and around the world.

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

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

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order today.

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

There was no objection.

ADVANCING FRONTIERS OF SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to appear here on the House floor today to join with the majority leader and Members of Congress who will be with me here today to express our strong support for maintaining America's leadership role in the ex-

ploration of outer space, and our leadership role in advancing the frontiers of science, to demonstrate through the examples we will give today and the presentations that we have of the many, many tangible ways in which the mission of NASA, our leadership in the exploration of space, and America's leadership in the advancement of the frontiers of science have touched and changed the lives of Americans individually, and advanced the freedom and prosperity of the Nation and the world as a whole.

Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support NASA's new vision for our continued exploration of the universe. Forty-three years ago, President John F. Kennedy laid out a vision of space exploration that became a reality 8 years later when Neil Armstrong stepped onto the Moon. With the Apollo missions, America led the world in space exploration and propelled decades of technological and biological research that continue to benefit us to this day.

Four decades later, President George W. Bush offered the Nation another bold and challenging vision of space exploration that will keep America economically, technologically, and militarily strong. Congress needs to support this mission so we can work with NASA to achieve the goal of returning Americans to the Moon and sending astronauts to Mars and beyond.

NASA's new space exploration vision comes at a time when America faces increased competition from other nations. Aside from Russia, the People's Republic of China now has an ambitious space flight program. China has already launched a spacecraft into low-Earth orbit and is intent on developing a manned aerospace and lunar exploration program.

We need to return the Space Shuttle to flight, complete the International Space Station, and extend our presence across the solar system by developing a new crew exploration vehicle.

Space exploration not only advances the Nation's vision. It provides jobs, growth and opportunity to millions of American workers. Being the leader in space flight also makes America the leader in commercial research and development. The end of the last century witnessed rapid advances in science and technology that could only have been accomplished by astronauts conducting research in space. Microgravity experiments on the Space Shuttle and the International Space Station led to the creation of next-generation silicon computer chips and laser communication. Experiments on the Shuttle in the early 1990s fostered the development of a manufacturing process known as liquid phase centering that is now being used to produce over \$20 billion worth of products in the United States.

Human space flight stimulates our economy and increases our global competitiveness. A new vision must be launched if we are to maintain our lead in space and ensure our viability as a Nation for decades to come. Like it or not, other nations are sending their citizens into space and seeking to reap the rewards of those journeys.

In an ever-changing and more unpredictable world, we cannot afford to cede our leadership role in space. We have come too far and paid too high a price to turn our backs on the future. Supporting NASA's new space exploration vision and a reasonable investment in NASA's budget this year will keep us on a path toward our nation's destiny.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT). It is important that he mentioned that the nation of China has an aggressive space program. They have set a goal of going to the Moon. It reminds me that centuries ago, the Chinese had one of the greatest fleets in the world. The emperor who built that great fleet, composed of ships, I understand, that any one of which could have sailed up the Thames River prior to Columbus' discovery of America and conquered all of England because of their superiority in fire power and the maneuverability of the ships. That emperor who built that fleet died, and the succeeding emperor decided to keep China focused on itself and burned the fleet at the docks in order to keep the Chinese focused inward. As a result, the Chinese lost that great advantage they had in the exploration of the seas, and ceded not only control, they basically lagged far behind the rest of the world in technology, exploration, and freedom.

Mr. CALVERT. The gentleman is correct. Not only did the aforementioned emperor burn the fleet, if I remember correctly, he was the one that first ordered the construction of the wall to insulate themselves from the rest of the world. That insulation stayed for some centuries, and they put themselves way back in the pecking order of the world. The Chinese now are trying to catch up. They are putting a lot of their national treasure and expertise into outer space.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, the Chinese recognize the importance of reaching outward to the nations in not only exploration, but of the tremendous technological benefits to the nation as a whole, and of commerce with other nations. The American people understand that the advancement of exploration of space, the advancement of the frontiers of science bring benefits to us individually and promote the cause of freedom.

Mr. CALVERT. In the 1950s, it was the Russians that first went into outer space with Sputnik. That launched a new generation of young people to go into engineering, science, and technology. Those folks were the backbone of what was the Gemini and the Apollo

programs. It was a great part of our history as we went to the Moon and did some wonderful things in outer space.

As the gentleman well knows, in recent times we have starved our science budget. We are not doing as good a job as we should be doing in space exploration, which helped us bring along the personal computer, the types of equipment that we see in our cars that can tell us where we are at any moment, all of these amazing technologies that we just count on. The gentleman is correct, if we do not continue this investment, we are going to be behind in the world, and other nations are going to be ahead of us.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is truly only the Federal Government with the resources we have available to pour into scientific research, much of the work that scientists do, much of the work that NASA does, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, the magnificent discoveries that have been made at JPL in California, a part of NASA, have been as a result of the dedicated support of this Congress and of the United States to put the resources, the commitment necessary to run down a lot of the rabbit trails that are necessary. There may be some dead ends there. There are going to be failures and setbacks. Exploration is dangerous; it is hard. Pushing the frontiers of knowledge is hard and requires a commitment that each and every American shares in their heart and they are counting on us to be there, to give the people at NASA, at JPL, and our scientists the support that they need.

Mr. CALVERT. We are a Nation of pioneers. We are a Nation that explores the unknown, and science gives us the ability to go to outer space. Really, outside of the oceans of our Earth, which we continue to explore, space is the next frontier that has unlimited exploration and unlimited discoveries that can help us on this Earth and make us literally the leader of the world for many centuries to come.

Mr. CULBERSON. I know the gentleman has seen partnerships in California, as we have in Texas, between NASA and our universities. The research that is done between NASA and our universities has yielded tangible benefits in medical technology and in so many different ways.

We are going to be on this floor talking about those benefits which have touched the lives of individual Americans, particularly in the area of medicine, which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) who has just joined us, is so familiar with.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) to join us in this colloquy to lay out the benefits individually and collectively as a Nation that have come to us from the exploration of space and the work that NASA is doing.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be here and join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Space is important to the future of our country. We are a Nation of pioneers. We are a Nation of explorers. We lead the world in science and technology. Everywhere I go as I travel around the United States, I see images at schools, at universities, and in airports of our space program. Frequently I will see pictures or images of the Shuttle or of our Apollo pioneers; and the reason for that I think is obvious. It is in our blood, it is in our nature.

Indeed, the gentleman mentioned I am a physician and practiced medicine for 15 years before I was elected, and I still see patients once a month at the VA clinic in my congressional district; and I always marvel at the daily application of space technology, spin-off technologies directly from our Shuttle program, from our Apollo program, even from some of our unmanned probes.

□ 1600

I have a contractor in my congressional district who has taken the NASA coolant technology used to cool the systems in these planetary probes that we use and has placed it in car and home air conditioner units and believes he can improve the efficiency of these air conditioner units by as much as 15 percent. The potential savings in electricity demand from a product like that, if it is able to yield its full potential, could be in the order of hundreds of billions of dollars over a period of just a few years. As a matter of fact, if this product proved to be as useful as he believes it may be, it could potentially pay for the space program several times over.

Of course, as I was referring to earlier, as a physician we use space technology in many of our imaging modalities, like MRI scanning and CAT scanning. We use space technology in a lot of our pacemaker capabilities, these implantable defibrillators. Indeed, even the prosthetic devices, such as artificial limbs, some of the materials science that goes into those devices are actually spin-off benefits of the space program.

So I rise today to join my colleagues in speaking out in support of the national space initiative that I think President Bush so eloquently laid out in his speech at NASA headquarters several months ago.

It is really critical that we move ahead with this agenda, because one of the problems that I found within NASA from virtually the moment of my arrival is there was not really a clear agenda of where NASA was going. NASA had a very clear agenda when John F. Kennedy originally articulated it, I believe he was at Rice University, if I am not mistaken, in his famous speech, "We go to the moon not because it is easy, but because it is hard," and NASA had a clear agenda of getting a man on the moon. But since that time it has been a little unclear.

Now the President has laid out very clearly an agenda, and I want to underscore for all my colleagues in the

House of Representatives and the other body, this is an affordable agenda. Some people have ridiculed this as costing \$1 trillion and being impossible to do.

But with the tragic loss of *Columbia*, I think it has been clear and obvious to everyone that, for our manned space flight program to continue, we need to come up with a replacement for the space shuttle in the years ahead. We cannot continue to rely on this system. It has been a great system, but it is down now, it could go down again in the future, and when it goes down, we are dependent on the Russians for the support and service of the Space Station.

So the President has laid out I think an affordable initiative to come up with a replacement vehicle for the space shuttle, but this vehicle would not just go and from low earth orbit, like the space shuttle does, but it would have the flexibility to be able to go back to the moon, to go on to Mars, and it can support the Space Station in the years ahead.

Importantly included in this vision as well is the priority of reorienting the Space Station research. There have been a lot of people who have questioned what the purpose of the Space Station is, and the President has clearly put forward in his national initiative the vision of saying that we are going to focus the Space Station research on answering a lot of these questions about biological sciences in terms of how people live and work in space.

As a physician, I know a fair amount about this. If you look at people who go up to the Space Station and spend 3 or 6 months there, when they come back, they frequently have problems standing up in the gravitational field of the Earth, they have problems with anemia, there are problems with bone loss, there are problems with blood loss, actually, something called the hemoglobin hematocrit decline in the setting of a prolonged space exposure. So we need a better understanding of that if we are ever to go to Mars and if we are ever to go beyond Mars and if we are going to create a permanent presence in space, such as on the moon.

Now, the President's vision does call for going back to the moon and going on to Mars, but he lays out an initiative I think in a way that calls for international cooperation, so that this would be something that is affordable.

The most important thing that I want to say tonight in this dialogue with my colleagues here is that some Members of the House of Representatives have criticized the budget request from the President as it relates to NASA and feel that we should not go to Mars, and therefore we need to reduce this budget request. But I just want to underscore the bulk of the President's request is to get the shuttle flying again and to complete construction of the Space Station.

To say we want to cut NASA now is to basically to say, well, we do not

want to fly the shuttle again, and we do not want to complete the Space Station construction. I do not think in any way there is a majority of colleagues here in this body who are saying that we do not want to do those things.

So we need to put the resources behind NASA, I think, so that they can move ahead with getting the shuttle flying again safely and getting the Space Station completed. We have international partners.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, if we could have a little colloquy, it is important to point out to the American people and to the fellow Members of Congress that the President's vision which he laid out so eloquently and so clearly for the future of space exploration in this Nation is simply moving money largely within NASA's budget, preprogramming \$11 billion within NASA's existing, projected budget to achieve this vision. The vision itself only calls for an additional \$1 billion over the next 5 years in spending above the fiscal year 2004 budget.

It is important to keep in perspective, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) so correctly pointed out, that at the time of Apollo, the Nation committed 4 percent of our budget, 4 percent of the Federal budget, was committed to the Apollo program. Yet today what the President is asking for is simply less than 1 percent of the Federal budget to be invested in the exploration of space and pushing the frontiers of science.

Mr. CALVERT. As my friend from Texas understands also, this is about transformation. This is a time of transformation in the military. It is a time of transformation for NASA, to become refocused upon their primary mission; and their primary mission, I think we all agree, is the exploration of outer space. This is a great opportunity for this country to once again get back to our national dream of space exploration.

As the gentleman from Florida mentioned, whether or not we can afford this, I would say we cannot afford not to. The type of technologies that we have been able to share with this country that have come out of the space program are irreplaceable.

Look what we are doing with energy. The gentleman mentioned energy. Solar. We look at solar as a renewable resource. I cannot think of many folks that have done more work on solar research than NASA, because of what we use solar for today, to help get the energy that is necessary to keep the station going.

The fuel cell technology really started with NASA. Hydrogen technology, fuel cell technology, that gives us a clean source of energy, some people really believe the next generation of energy that will sustain this country as we move away from an oil-based economy.

Communications, where would we be without our cell phones? Sometimes I

wonder. But it is those satellites up there that keep us communicating with one another.

All of the types of technologies that come from this fantastic investment, and I say "investment" in the true sense, the return on this, I do not think of many things we do in government that we get a higher return than what we do with the money we put in this.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman would yield on that, there is another interesting aspect of that, and I think it is really an unmeasurable return on the investment.

One of the things I have been most intrigued by when I talk to teachers, and I have had conversations with teachers from all over this country on this issue, as many people know, we have a problem with not enough young people going into math and sciences. If you go to many of our colleges and universities, the bulk of the graduate students are foreigners.

If you talk to our teachers in our schools, they will tell you the thing that gets people most motivated to study math and science, young kids, what excites young kids in the third grade and the fourth grade and the sixth grade to really hunker down and study math and science, more than any other subject, it is the space program. When you take the science teaching, math teaching, and apply it to the space program, the teachers tell me it gets them excited.

How do you put a price tag on that? How do you measure that? You are talking about our competitiveness. Where are we creating jobs? We are creating jobs in the technology arenas. But if we are losing ground on technology because our young people are not studying those fields, then that can affect our whole economy. And how do you put a dollar value on that?

I think the gentleman is absolutely right, and he said it best, we cannot afford not to invest in NASA. It is one of the wisest investments that we can make in this body, because it is an investment in our future.

I would be very happy to yield to the majority leader. I am so pleased for the support the gentleman has supplied NASA over the years. It is great to have the gentleman with us.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I really appreciate his holding this special order, because it is so important to continue this debate on the President's vision, and this is a perfect way to do that, and I appreciate the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas and their comments.

If I could just make my comments, for four decades the men and women of NASA have done the impossible. Whether conquering Earth's gravity, or shooting the moon, or studying the vast expanse of space or just beyond our atmosphere, NASA has taken on every challenge put to it and succeeded. We owe them our thanks, and we owe them our loyalty.

But as valuable as the research NASA has conducted over the last two decades has been, both in its application in space and here on Earth, the time has come for NASA to once again dare mighty things. The President's vision asks them to do just that, to return the space shuttle to flight, to complete the International Space Station, to return to the moon and ultimately launch a manned mission to Mars.

The President's vision is bold, practical and consistent with America's tradition of leading mankind's journey into the unknown.

Now the only way this Nation could in good conscience walk away from our historic legacy in space, from the legacy of John Glenn, Allen Sheppard and Neil Armstrong, is if we determine that space exploration is no longer worth it, not worth America's expense, not worth America's risk, not worth America's time.

If the time had indeed come when mankind, and specifically the United States of America, had gotten out of space everything it could hope for, then I would be the first in line to declare victory over the unknown and move on to something else. But, of course, nothing of the sort is true. America's space program is not merely a choice but a mission in our national interests and in the interests of all nations.

Not worth the expense? Consider the value of the satellite technologies that we use to communicate which have become the basis of our national defense of this Nation; of touch tone and cellular phones; of global positioning technologies now employed in Iraq and Afghanistan to win the war on terror; of magnetic resonance imaging, which has revolutionized medicine; the automatic insulin pump, which has saved and improved millions of lives; or the portable X-ray machine.

Madam Speaker, our economy, our national defense and our ability to communicate with each other and the world, for that matter, would simply be unrecognizable to us without the expensive space travel paid for by previous generations of Americans.

Not worth the risk? Exploration, mankind's inherent curiosity and will to discover the truth, not worth the risk? Such thinking, Madam Speaker would have left Columbus in Spain, Magellan in Portugal and Lewis and Clark in Virginia.

The history of mankind is not a matter of advance despite the risks, but advance, in a sense, because of them. Of course, space travel is risky. It is the most dangerous enterprise in history but also the greatest adventure.

If space travel were easy, everyone would be doing it. We are lucky, lucky despite the hardships and tragedies that we have endured, to have been chosen by history and providence to live in a nation with the collective wealth and courage to meet such harrowing challenges, to live such an

adventure. And no one knows this more than our astronauts, all of whom would gladly take on those challenges, and many more, for the opportunity to serve this Nation and all mankind in this endeavor.

Now I concede that space travel is risky, but so is anything worth doing, and the risk involved in turning our backs on space far outweigh the risk of advancing further into it, which is why questions about the President's timing are the least viable. We are at war, we are told, and facing a budget crunch. Come back when times are rosier, and then we can look at space again.

□ 1615

But, Madam Speaker, the President's assertion that the time is now for America to reestablish its space program is not only correct; it is urgent. We are at war, just as we were when Neil Armstrong walked on the Moon.

The budget is constricted; but for 4 decades, America's mission in space has been one of the surest economic investments the Federal Government has made. Rocketry, satellite technology, cellular telephony, the MRI, all of these were direct benefits of the space program, solutions to problems found in space. And they are just the tip of the iceberg of the knowledge that we have discovered and a subtle foreshadowing of what we will learn.

There is simply no telling what new innovations await our Nation, our economy, our health care, our national defense, when NASA's engineers begin staring down even larger problems of long-term space flight. What will a fully constructed international space station discover during its intensive research on bioastronautics? What engineering and medical miracles will be created to compensate for an astronaut's prolonged exposure to radiation and microgravity? What new materials and devices will be forged in the development of a new crew exploration vehicle? And what applications will these discoveries have to our life on Earth?

We cannot answer these questions without first having the courage to allow our scientists and engineers at NASA to have at them.

The President's vision is a bold challenge to each and every one of them, and to each and every one of us, to do it again. And when they do, Americans of all ages, from seniors who remember a time before NASA, to children who never saw an Apollo landing, will come together one night in the future, look up in the sky, see that tiny red dot 50 million miles away, and know that somewhere up there Americans are doing the impossible.

The President's vision is a vision of that night. It is a vision that will fulfill the promise of the Mercury Seven and inspire the dreams of their grandchildren.

Generations of scientists and engineers were drawn into their fields by the awesome images and historic competition of the space race. It is time to

reignite the torch of knowledge and push deeper into the darkness. Thousands of years to get to Kitty Hawk, and only 66 more to get to the Moon.

The time has come, Madam Speaker, for our Nation to strap itself in for the next leg of that journey. We have come too far as a Nation and as a world to turn back now. Even as we fight to liberate mankind from the oppression of tyranny and terror, we have an opportunity, and I believe a calling, to liberate mankind from the ancient oppression of ignorance of the unknown that continues to hold us back.

The answers are a long and difficult road away, but despite the costs, risks, and hardship, we can get there from here. Back to space, back to the Moon, and on to Mars.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader, who has so eloquently and forcefully set forth the benefits in so many ways to this Nation of the President's vision for outer space, of space exploration. Because the best evidence I could give in support of what the leader has just told us of the value of what the President has set forth is to quote Thomas Jefferson in his charge to the Lewis and Clark expedition. Two hundred years ago, President Jefferson set forth very simply to Meriwether Lewis: "The object of your mission is to explore the Missouri River." And that simple charge, that simple direction from the President of the United States to explore the Missouri River has led to the expansion of the United States to the Pacific Ocean and the innumerable benefits that flowed from that.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, just in closing, I would like to point out that in this very building, we were in a conflict between the States and the President at that time. Abraham Lincoln made a determination that the business of the Union would go forward, and the dome of this very building was completed during the Civil War. The business of this Nation moves forward. As a matter of fact, the underpinnings of the great railroad that bound this Nation together was done while Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States while the Civil War was raging across this Nation, but the business of the Republic moved forward.

So to say that we should stop the exploration of outer space for whatever reason is not a good reason, and I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, as the majority leader said, the exploration of space is hard; it is a difficult task. Pushing the frontiers of science forward is also. The support of NASA is a cause that knows no political boundaries.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleague and neighbor, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE); and I

am pleased to yield to her at this time so that she may express in her own words her view of the importance of the mission of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's mission to maintain America's leadership role in outer space.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and I am very glad that it is acknowledged that the idea of exploration, the idea of being a pioneer is not only Texan, but it is American and it is bipartisan. So I am delighted to be able to join my colleague not only in support, but also in raising the probative questions that need to be raised as we look at the vision that has been put forward in going to Mars and to the Moon.

First of all, it is exciting to see the amount of energy that has been generated by many of our advocates and supporters, particularly the entities that are engaged in research and space exploration as to the kind of thinking that is going on, the kind of vehicle that would be appropriate. I believe that it is important to note that our astronauts class is still one of the most sought-after opportunities, educational opportunities. In fact, I just met 2 days ago the first Puerto Rican astronaut who will be joining us in Houston sometime in August. That class was recently graduated, and I believe there are 600 or more that applied and only a few were able to obtain that particular high honor.

So I come to the floor today to indicate that the mission as evidenced by the administration is a bold new mission for NASA and that it only ensures a new life. I know that we are compelled to think about the issues of the day, whether it is Iraq or Afghanistan, whether or not it is the choices we have to make in the appropriations and budgeting process; but I have confidence in the American will and desire and in this Congress. I for one would hope that we would recognize that choices have to be made that require us to invest. As my good friend knows, we may have different opinions on tax cuts and other uses of our resources, but I hope that we will not couch this effort as borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. I hope that we will recognize that these goals are particularly important, as it provides opportunities for our young people in math and science, as it provides opportunity for reaching man's limits, and as well, it provides opportunity for the research that has been helpful to us in the past.

When I came to this Congress, we found it very difficult to pass the NASA budget, but we began to turn our attention to the American people. We began to educate and visit the schools and highlight the value of NASA and space exploration, and I like to call it the National Aeronautics Space Agency; but, more importantly, most of us know Johnson or Marshall or Kennedy, anyone who has had the privilege of seeing a launching of one of our very

fine human space shuttles, they know the excitement and the exhilaration that comes with it, but more importantly, they know how it impacts our lives. We have seen a decided improvement in cancer research, HIV research, stroke and heart disease because of our ability to go into space.

We also know that man has pushed our own human limits, men and women, because of the ability to live on the international space station. The international space station has been one of our greatest accomplishments where people are actually living in space. So the idea of stopping off at the international space station and then going on to the Moon and Mars is something that is both understandable and achievable.

Might I say to my good friends, however, that there are certain elements that we must have a bipartisan expression of, and that, of course, is the idea of making sure that we have the resources to invest in this plan. We need to have the administration delineate for us the precise dollars that we will utilize; and, of course, we want to know, which is one of the difficulties, I say to my good friend from Texas, that we are facing is people have their advocacies, whether it is basic research, whether it is unmanned space exploration. We have to ensure that NASA remains whole and that again, we do not implode the department and take from them, but to foster the space exploration, so we must work together in a bipartisan way to ensure that.

The other thing that we must do is the question of safety. I am looking forward to very productive hearings, bipartisan hearings, that will make sure that we have the T's crossed and the I's dotted, and that we look in a combined way at space safety legislation to make sure that when we send people into space that we can assure the American people that every single I is dotted and every T is crossed.

I know that the commission that has just met in New York is going to give us a 10-point report. I hope that we do not kill the messenger, that we will look at this 10-point report and be able to go down one by one and step by step to ensure that it is followed.

Let me also say that the people going to space are heroes. How many of us remember John Glenn, growing up with him? We do not want to tell our ages, but how many remember growing up with John Glenn? How many remember the challenge that President John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave to us: the stars in our eyes, the stars in the eyes of children to come? How many of us have ever had the chance to meet an astronaut, as I have, having them come into my congressional district? And do my colleagues know that at my annual Christmas party, the astronauts are more famous and popular than Santa Claus? How about that? So we realize that they can provide an impetus of excitement.

Might I just say that I want to thank you and a number of Members who pro-

vided me with 320 cosponsors, as an aside, to honor those heroes who went into space on Columbia Seven. Let their heroism be not a sign or a statement to close down the space exploration; but as their family members have said, let it be a challenge, if you will, to continue it in a more safe and positive way.

I look forward to us generating the kind of space vehicle and the kind of space power, if you will, of the kinds of humans trained to go to Mars and to the Moon, to do it in a unique and very special way. But I remind my colleagues that we must as well work with the administration on an agenda that will give us the kind of roadmap that will take us through this process.

So I am delighted to be able to come not only to provide support, but to ask the hard questions and to make sure that most are aware that we are going to ask the hard questions of budget, of investment, making sure that we do not take from needed programs that I know that the gentleman supports along with many others, such as housing and education and health care, but that this investment is one that puts America just where it needs to be: at the front of the line, on the cutting-edge of science and research that will ultimately open not only the doors and minds of future mathematicians and scientists, but also it will open the doors to physicians and cardiologists and those dealing with kidney disease, because we will be able to do the kind of research there that may open the doors to better health for America, as well as a better quality of life for all Americans.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for holding this Special Order, and I hope that when we see each other next, we will be working on a definitive space exploration program that all of our colleagues will find virtue in and will be able to support in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for calling this hearing to discuss the future of NASA's mission in space, and to understand how the President's new budget fits in that picture. NASA is at a great turning point. Our work here today, and in the upcoming months, could determine if in a century, our kids' kids' kids will be exploring Mars, or if they will be walking through a museum, learning about how long, long ago Americans used to boldly explore the heavens.

I would like to join you in welcoming Dr. Marburger and Administrator O'Keefe. I commend them for their work so far, in keeping us informed on the President's new initiative for human-space flight. Successfully crafting the new mission for NASA will take unprecedented cooperation between the Administration, and Congress, and the private sector, and the American people. I thank the gentlemen for coming today. We must keep this dialogue going.

First, I would like to commend the President for articulating his bold new vision for NASA's future. We have much work to do to ensure that we fine tune that plan, to make sure it fits our goals scientifically, meets our responsibilities, and works within our means in a tough

economy. Unfortunately, we are in a time of tight budgets, due to horrible financial mismanagement by this Administration over the past three years. But space exploration is not about FY05, or even about 5-year projections. It is about an ongoing quest that captures people's minds and hearts, drives our technology to the cutting edge, and pushes our economy forward. We cannot afford to abandon progress in space every time we fall on challenging times. If we allow NASA to follow a boom-bust cycle, it will never have a committed workforce with the expertise and experience necessary to do great things.

So, I feel we must move forward boldly, but not so boldly that we allow the program to collapse under its own weight. We must be safe, and we must be prudent in making methodical steps, to the moon, to Mars, and beyond.

For example, it is exciting to think of building the next generation vehicle, and to retire the space shuttle. But if we are on schedule to decommission the shuttle in 2010, and then fall behind on the schedule to replace it due to shifting budget priorities, we could be caught in a very tough place. We may lose access to the International Space Station that we have invested so much in. We could start losing quality NASA employees to the private sector or to retirement, and lose their institutional memory as well. That could make it very difficult to restart a viable program in the future.

Of course, I am especially interested in how this new mission will affect Johnson Space Center near my district in Houston. As the hub of the manned space program over the years, Houston has so much to offer this new mission. However, instability as old programs give way to new, could be detrimental to the space community and the city as a whole.

And finally I am concerned about safety. Since the *Columbia* tragedy, we are all working together to re-focus on safety—improving the NASA safety “culture” as some call it. We still have much work to do on that. We need to make substantial improvement before we turn all of our thoughts to new things. However, space exploration is good and needed, and I am looking forward to a clear road map from the administration.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas, because support of NASA, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, America's exploration of space, and keeping our leadership in space is indeed something that we can work on in a bipartisan way, because this is truly an American and Texan endeavor, to be at the frontiers of exploration.

My colleague is right about the popularity and importance of NASA's exploration to the average American. The NASA Web site, in fact, has had more hits on it than any Web site in history in a shorter period of time. NASA is now at over 10 billion hits on their Web site, in large part due to the spectacular success of the Mars exploration Rover program and the scientists at NASA. JPL, Steve Squires, all deserve our thanks and our sincere congratulations for their magnificent achievement in pulling together this extraordinary complicated mission of landing two rovers in completely separate parts of Mars to bring that program to-

gether in such a short period of time, to have it achieve such spectacular success so flawlessly. They deserve our congratulations and our admiration for what they have achieved. They are indeed a great inspiration to the Nation, to young people here in America and all over the world who recognize the value of not only exploring space, but pushing the frontiers of science.

□ 1630

As the majority leader so eloquently said and as my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has pointed out, there are so many different technologies that have spun off from NASA that are important.

It occurred to me as I was listening to the majority leader's very eloquent remarks, and my colleague, my neighbor just to the east, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) pointing out NASA's many successes, I am reminded of a book we were just reading, my wife and I, to our daughter, Caroline Virginia, who is fascinated with Harry Houdini, the magician. We were reading a book to Caroline about Houdini, and it pointed out Houdini had a hard time succeeding when he began as a magician until someone pointed out to him that he was making it look too easy. He was so good at what he did that he made it look easy. The audience could not really appreciate how difficult it was, what he was doing. Houdini took that to heart and began to make his act look more difficult.

I do not want NASA to make it look more difficult, but I think NASA's great success at making it look easy at overcoming the spectacular hurdles that confront them has been in part perhaps one of the reasons that people take NASA's work for granted.

I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my colleague makes a very good point. I wanted to say that is why those of us on the Committee on Science, and certainly he has been working with us, and we have worked with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, and before him, of course, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), but there are a number of Texans who have been engaged, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL), on that committee and have had special advocacies. But what we have said is that, in addition to what you have been able to announce for us, is that NASA also has taken a hard look at safety.

I think it is important to say to the American people that we are not reckless in suggesting that we go to Mars or the moon. We know that we will bring about great research and great opportunities, but we also realize that it is important, our obligation as the United States Congress, to ensure that this is a safe process.

And might I just also say that we are fortunate that presidents, starting, of

course, with John F. Kennedy and then Lyndon Baines Johnson, have been supportive of the effort in space. We are very lucky that it has been an American issue. And that carried forth with William Jefferson Clinton and other previous presidents. But, because of that, I hope that this Congress takes seriously the idea that we cannot shut it down. We must continue it, looking to make it better, but we must continue it because it is something that belongs to all of America.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly no better, if I may, no better expression of the importance of the mission of NASA and maintaining America's leadership role in space, what better expression of that than to have my colleague and me here, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) in complete agreement on that.

I would challenge any Member of the House to show someone with a stronger fiscally conservative record than I, looking carefully at the dollars we always together, my colleague and I, have been there to support NASA, as has the majority leader, who is also our neighbor from Houston. There are no political parties, there are no political divisions, I think, between us in helping NASA and the jet propulsion laboratory and the pride that we feel in their magnificent achievements and acknowledging and congratulating them for their spectacular success with the Mars Rover and recognizing in less than 1 month that NASA's Casini mission will go into orbit around Saturn and shortly thereafter, the first of the year, NASA will be landing a European-built lander on the surface of Titan, the only other planet in the solar system, a moon of Saturn, that has an atmosphere as dense as that of the earth.

We, both of us, in representing Houston recognize the importance of the Texas Medical Center and the work that they do with NASA in so many ways has saved lives.

If I could point out something that I am sure my colleague is familiar with, the work that Dr. Michael DeBakey has done using space shuttle technology. The shuttle has these huge turbo pumps that are required to empty the spacecraft's external tanks of more than 525,000 gallons of liquid hydrogen and oxygen in less than 8.5 minutes. Dr. DeBakey got together with NASA, with a private team as well, and developed the MicroMed-DeBakey ventricular assist device using NASA's shuttle technology to pump hydrogen and oxygen out of those fuel tanks, to miniaturize that into a device that has kept people alive so they could have heart transplants, that have helped people's hearts heal so they could avoid a transplant.

As Dr. Rosenbaum pointed out, the heart pump, the MicroMed-DeBakey ventricular assist device, is a perfect blend of NASA engineering and medicine. The same laws of physics that

apply to building and flying a space-craft apply to building and operating a heart pump.

As Dr. DeBaKey said, when you have got intense research going on like this, new knowledge is bound to flow from it. I know my colleague has seen that benefit as well.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Absolutely. We are very fortunate that we have two giants in Texas, both Dr. Benton Cooley and Dr. DeBaKey, who have established outstanding hospitals, but we know that Dr. DeBaKey is the founder and originator of MASH, of the MASH unit in World War II.

But it speaks to the idea of the distinguished gentleman from Texas that we are still living and learning, and the ability to be able to do this in space or do this kind of research in space gives us a greater opportunity to extend the lives of Americans and people around the world.

I think it would be important now just to note for our colleagues that this mission is on a timeline that is very crucial. And that is, of course, 2008 the crew exploration vehicle which will carry astronauts to the moon, we are looking to have scheduled and to make its first unmanned test flight. In 2008, the robotic craft will start flying to the moon to prepare for human expeditions.

The reason why I say this is because I understand that you had a distinguished gentleman from California on the floor of the House. I already mentioned the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and his leadership, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL) and his leadership, mentioned the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL). A number of them have been on the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. But the reason why I mention the diversity of States and the distinguished gentleman from Florida is because this should not be looked upon as a sole purview of the great State of Texas. But, in fact, there will be opportunities for many, many people to be engaged.

The robotic craft starts flying, as I said, in 2008; 2014 the crew exploration vehicle makes its first manned flight; and then 2015 to 2020 astronauts return to the moon. So we are gradually having a wide-reaching impact.

My colleague mentioned it earlier, but I do not know if Americans realize one of our greatest international relation efforts has been space. China, India, Israel, some of our countries in South America, France, and others have been engaged in this process; and we have found commonality around space. It is crucial.

The other thing that I think it does for those of us who represent very diverse districts, it provides the teaching tools and the incentives so that not only your daughter is excited about what happens in space but that we find children who are in inner city schools, African Americans and Hispanics and Asians and others, that may not view

this as an opportunity for them, people from rural America, people from Appalachia, if you will, that have not had opportunities to be exposed.

We want their children to be the next pool of astronauts and scientists and mathematicians. The only way one does that is you have something for them to do. We do not have anything for them to do. We cannot expect that they will be engaged in these disciplines, biology, chemistry, being doctors like Dr. DeBaKey, as my colleague mentioned, Dr. Cooley.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, if I might, ignite that spark in their heart to know that the United States, the country they are so privileged to live in, is a leader in the exploration of space, in pushing the frontiers of science, to light that spark in the heart of a young person is one of the greatest things that we can do. NASA has certainly done that.

I am probably the most fiscally conservative Member of this House. My good friend from Houston knows how carefully I examine every single request to spend money that is presented to me as an appropriator. I am working diligently to balance the Federal budget. I am a co-author of the Balanced Budget Amendment. I want to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and the lead author of the amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), for bringing the balanced budget amendment to the floor of this House.

We need to pay off the national debt, balance the Federal budget. When it comes to investing in scientific research and maintaining America's leadership role in outer space, both of us, I think between the two of us we pretty much cover the political spectrum, recognize that NASA, JPL, and scientific research is our national insurance policy for the future, prosperity of the country, and it will ignite that spark in the hearts of young people. I know my colleague has seen that in her district.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would not disagree with my colleague at all on that and what that leads to. And I know that I can encourage my good friend, in spite of or alongside of his fiscal posture that he takes, and do know that he is very staunch in his review, as I am very staunch in ensuring the domestic needs of our Nation with respect to health and education and housing are as well invested in.

But as we look at space it would be important for our colleagues to know that as we fund this effort it sort of generates or springs forth opportunities in education, investing in math and science for our young people so that we can create the kinds of research experts that will be part of this program that my good friend is talking about.

So there are benefits beyond just a few going into space. It generates a whole industry, a whole chemistry be-

tween industry and between the government in creating jobs that will provide for a very strong core of people who understand the very technical aspects, the very sophisticated aspects of science and math and chemistry and physics which are so very important.

We never want to lose the cutting edge of being at the very top of having that kind of discipline and expertise in our Nation. We never want to be a Nation that does not produce something, does not manufacture something, is not brilliant enough to create new science. That is what NASA provides, that opportunity.

I would only say, in your wisdom of your own political stand on being fiscally responsible, I would also charge you as being a man that has a great understanding that America has to invest in order to have returns. So we have to make choices. Hopefully, the choice of NASA and space exploration does not eliminate our opportunities to invest our education and health and other resources.

So I thank the distinguished gentleman again for bringing us all together. I think it is extremely important that our colleagues know that we do not stand here only as Texans, that my colleague had Floridians and he had Californians and maybe some others that were here before me and there are people from Tennessee and individuals from New York, our chairman, and so we have people from all over that I hope will rally around the idea of space being valuable and having us be at the cutting edge of this very valuable program.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas and look forward to working with her to ensure that NASA gets the support it needs, that the President's vision that he has laid out so clearly and so eloquently for the future of NASA and for the future of scientific research in this country, that we give the President's vision the support that it deserves.

As the majority leader so eloquently pointed out earlier, the exploration of space is indeed a difficult task; and it will require the efforts of every Member of this Congress working together from every part of the political spectrum.

I am so pleased to have the majority leader's leadership on this effort, to have the full support of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) there, here in the House of Representatives. He understands the importance of scientific research, the importance of NASA, the Johnson Space Center now being located, of course, in Houston.

The unity that has been shown here on this floor, between my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), and myself and the majority leader in supporting NASA I think speaks volumes of the kind of support that I think we will see from this Congress when the time comes to get behind NASA.

Every American out there needs to, I think, express themselves to their

elected officials, to their Members of Congress, just as they have done in all the hits they have made on the NASA Web site.

I would conclude by pointing out that we will continue to be here on a regular basis pointing out the benefits of NASA's work over the years, the importance of the President's vision, supporting what he has laid out for NASA, for the jet propulsion laboratory.

□ 1645

I would also like to conclude by quoting my hero, Thomas Jefferson, who pointed out perhaps the greatest benefit of our investment in science. Mr. Jefferson was fond of saying, and it is so very true, that the first-born child of science is always freedom.

With that, I close, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Vision for Space Exploration. Since 1969, America has led the world into space and it is time to renew that vision. Our ventures into space not only keep America at the forefront of exploration and innovation, but they also are vital to our economy and our national security. This new National Vision sets America on a course toward the Moon and Mars, and we should embrace this dream and work to make it a reality.

In my mind, the first step of this new journey back to the Moon, Mars, and beyond, is to return the space shuttle to flight. I say this for several important reasons. First, our country made a commitment to our international partners that we would complete the construction of the International Space Station. Only the space shuttle is capable of completing this all-important task. Second, as the preeminent leader in human space flight, we cannot afford to sit idle and let other nations reap the rewards of our hard work, research, and sacrifice. We know that the People's Republic of China has developed a human space flight program that encompasses everything from low earth orbit to exploring the Moon and Mars. To let our space shuttle fleet, the most sophisticated and advanced space craft the world has ever seen, sit idle while other nations pass us by would be counter-productive to our space program. We must, however temper this thrust to Mars with economic realism. While people are more interested today in being able to make a trip to the grocery store than go to Mars—we agree that this is the time to initiate a sensible, stepping-stone, approach to investment in planning and carrying out our long-term mission.

It is, however, incumbent on us to do all we can to return astronauts to space safely. Last year's *Columbia* disaster underscored the sad reality that we have not done enough to ensure crew safety. I authored an amendment that was included in last year's NASA funding bill that calls for \$15 million to be used to solicit the best concepts from the aerospace industry and elsewhere to improve shuttle crew survivability. It is critical that the Space Shuttle Program continue to improve survivability for its remaining service life—including making modifications for the crew, such as cabin thermal/structural hardening, improved flight suits, and search and rescue capability.

Meanwhile, as NASA develops the new crew exploration vehicle for human space flight, we need to make sure that a viable

crew escape system for our astronauts is incorporated into the design of the spacecraft. I would suggest that if NASA can find the money for a multibillion-dollar probe to Jupiter, then it can find the funds to make crew survivability a priority. As we implement the new space vision, I will work to ensure that NASA fulfills this priority and minimizes the risks for our brave men and women who fly our space missions. Our hopes and dreams ride with them, and we must do all we can, at whatever cost is necessary, to ensure their safety.

America's space program continues to be an engine for our national economy. Exploration brings jobs and technological growth to America. Last year, space exploration brought over \$3.7 billion in funds to universities and businesses in Texas alone. Nearly every State in the union benefits from the development of technologies needed to propel our space mission. At a time when we are all concerned about jobs leaving the United States, supporting NASA makes sense because we are providing good jobs for Americans.

The money that we put into NASA grows exponentially when we consider the scientific and technological spinoffs that space exploration provides. Experiments conducted on the space shuttle and International Space Station expand health research and move us toward cures for some of our most threatening diseases. Microgravity experiments in the 1990s led to advances in antibiotics to fight infections. These experiments also unlocked secrets to protein growth that produced medicines to treat patients who have suffered from strokes and to prepare them for open-heart surgery. Americans suffering from osteoporosis also benefit from bone-density experiments conducted on the International Space Station in microgravity environments. These tests accelerated the clinical trials of a drug that is expected to be on the market soon. From the development of MRI technology to microchips, the scientific partnerships between NASA and American universities and companies ensure our Nation's viability, increase our Nation's competitiveness, and help drive our economy.

On January 14, 2004, we were pointed toward a new vision for space exploration and a renewed commitment to the American dream of reaching for new frontiers. For the first time in 40 years, our Nation once again has a vision. We owe it to future generations of Americans and the men and women who have kept the space mission alive for four decades to continue to forge ahead. Congress should approve the modest 5.6-percent increase in NASA funds this year so that we can continue this journey, secure our national interest, and fulfill America's destiny in space.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our Nation's new vision for space exploration.

I represent north Alabama, which is home to NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center. Space exploration holds a special place in the hearts of my constituents. Marshall and its team designed and developed the Saturn launch vehicles which sent our Nation on its last inspiring journey to the Moon. I remember that journey—it was an exciting time for north Alabama, and it was an exciting time for our Nation.

Last year, I was one of 101 House Members who wrote a bipartisan letter to the President, urging him to focus NASA on an inspir-

ing mission. On January 14 of this year, we received a reply.

NASA was given a bold, new path—which will take our Nation on a journey of exploration and discovery that is affordable, achievable, and exciting.

The first element of the vision includes returning the space shuttle to flight, and completing the International Space Station. In fact, the bulk of the increase in NASA's requested FY05 budget is for getting the shuttle fleet off the ground, and continued ISS construction. The ISS will be used to learn how to extend human presence in the hostile environment of space.

The vision includes implementing a sustained human and robotic program to explore the solar system and beyond. Not one or the other, but both human and robotic exploration, using the strengths of each to expand their frontiers of our knowledge.

The vision includes a goal of returning humans to the Moon by year 2020, and using this as a stepping stone for human exploration of Mars and other destinations.

Along the way, this journey of exploration will require the development of innovative technologies, key knowledge, and enabling infrastructures. This vision will further U.S. scientific, security, and economic interests, and it also promotes international and commercial participation in exploration.

Mr. Speaker, this vision is affordable to our nation. NASA's requested budget includes modest increases for an agency that has been essentially level-funded, in constant dollars, for the past 10 years. The FY05 budget request for NASA represents 0.7 percent of the Federal budget, compared to 1 percent in 1994, and a peak of 4 percent during Apollo. Between 1993 and 2002, the Federal Government's discretionary spending grew in purchasing power by more than 25 percent. But NASA's funding profile over this same decade resulted in a loss in purchasing power of 13 percent. I recognize that our Nation has many other worthy demands on the Federal budget at this time—but this is something that only a great nation such as ours can do.

This vision is also achievable. The plan is not a race to the Moon or Mars, but a continuation of the spirit of exploration that is such an important part of America's heritage. And it is based on a spiral-development philosophy where you build on your accomplishments, learning from your successes—and your failures—along the way. We know that this approach can work—it already has, as Project Apollo built on the amazing achievements and occasional setbacks of Project Mercury and Project Gemini.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are some who say that NASA has not yet provided enough details about their exploration plan. They are working hard to provide us with the details. But we can all be assured that this body will have regular opportunities during the journey for strong congressional oversight.

We have a bold new vision for our Nation's space program laid out in front of us. This vision will help secure America's national security. This vision will help assure America's economic prosperity. And it will help strengthen America's technological competitiveness. Like the successes of Apollo, the benefits of this vision of exploration and discovery will be felt over generations.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 21st century, our Nation's space program is at a

crossroads. I urge my colleagues to grasp this historic opportunity, and join me in support of this vision that will reinvigorate our Nation's space program.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support NASA's new space exploration vision. Americans might ask: What is that vision? It means we are committed to these goals—

- Return the space shuttle to flight;
- Complete the International Space Station;
- Develop the Crew Exploration Vehicle;
- Go back to the Moon;
- Go to Mars;
- Increase NASA funding by almost 6 percent.

This new space exploration vision is a turning point for NASA.

We know there are inherent risks that come with space exploration, which is the pursuit of new knowledge and new worlds. Skepticism and doubt are often linked to NASA and its goals. But history provides the answers to those concerns.

The *Mercury*, *Gemini* and *Apollo* programs culminated in a great achievement: landing an astronaut on the moon.

In the past 45 years, NASA's explorations and scientific experiments have led to technological breakthroughs that have changed our lives. They include a heart pump implant system that prolongs lives, smoke detectors that have saved thousands from death and shape memory metal used in eyeglasses and golf clubs that make them bendable. Advancements have also included the unexpected, such as a new line of shock-absorbing athletic shoes.

I believe the new space exploration vision is affordable and achievable. To succeed it requires congressional support, leadership from the White House, and an unwavering belief that the impossible can one day become the possible.

Mr. Speaker, NASA has inspired the public since the *Mercury 7* astronauts had "the right stuff" to launch our space exploration program. Their legacy is secure.

Our challenge today is to honor the legacy and build upon it with a new vision. I believe we can. America still has the right stuff to make other giant leaps for mankind.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 2004

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 8, 2004, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

30-SOMETHING DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to address the House of Representatives and also the American people on issues of importance. A part of our democracy is being able to provide information to the

American people so that they can make the right decisions at the right time when they are given the opportunity. Also, to hopefully have an opportunity to speak to our colleagues about some of the issues that are facing this Congress and the American people, that they can also make the right decision at the right opportunity and at the right time.

We have more opportunities, the American people do, to make major decisions. They get an opportunity every couple of years as it relates to the House of Representatives, and in many cases every 6 years as it relates to the other body. But every 4 years they get an opportunity to vote for the leader of the free world, the President of the United States; and it is important that we understand exactly what is going on in our country, what is going on in the world.

This is an hour, Mr. Speaker, that the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), has put together for our 30-something Caucus that we have on the Democratic side on the aisle. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is my co-chair as it relates to our working group.

We have a number of members, some 14 Members of this House, that take time out every week to come to the floor. We have an opportunity to talk about issues that are facing young Americans and also middle-aged Americans and older Americans, because when we start talking about education, we start talking about health care, we start talking about jobs.

I think it is important we talk about Iraq. It is also important to all Americans, but we try to make sure that we be able to give voice to those individuals that are young parents and those individuals that are going into college and even young people that are looking to go to college to make sure that they have a great opportunity to do what they have to do.

I am so glad that my good friend from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is here with me, who is just an outstanding gentleman. We both serve on the Committee on Armed Services together, and we sit next to each other, almost next to each other, but we are there on the same level on the bottom row.

I thank the gentleman for being here. Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Over the past week, we had a break. We normally are doing our 30-something event on Tuesday nights, but we are here on Thursday night tonight, and we are going to take a little different twist here. Normally, we talk about issues that are facing young students, young people trying to make their way in the workforce.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Can I just, when the gentleman mentioned that, because we need to get into what we are getting ready to discuss right now, but I know the gentleman has a couple of e-mails. If we can just take 5 minutes and talk about this voter suppression issue.

As you know, over the last couple of weeks we have been getting phone calls and e-mails about students throughout the country going to supervisor of elections offices and being told that they cannot register to vote there. Those students that are now in summer school, students that would like to go into the fall and be able to have the opportunity to vote in the primary elections in many States and also in the general election. They are being told that they can not register to vote in that State because they are not a permanent resident. But, as you know, in 1975 the Supreme Court said you can register. It is legal.

So we got a response back from a number of people saying this has happened to me, and we asked them to go to rockthevote.com.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Rockthevote.com to help with voter suppression across the country. It will inform you about whatever your situation may be locally.

I just brought a couple of these that I wanted to read, because we are going to, obviously, move to another topic. We received a couple of e-mails that we pulled out here, one from a Luther Lowe from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, and one also from Alleyn Harned from Columbus, Ohio, who lives in Delaware. I am going to read a couple of paragraphs out of the e-mail we got, because most adults will say why are kids not participating and being active in the process? There is youth voter apathy.

I just want to read these. This is Luther Lowe from William and Mary. "Rather than sit and watch our local representatives make laws which are unfair to young people, I decided to participate in my local democracy. I applied to register to vote at Williamsburg which required I also fill out a detailed two-page questionnaire in addition to the normal form. One week later, I received a notification of my registration denial. The reasons? I was claimed on my parents' income taxes. I drove a car owned by my mom who lives in Arkansas. According to the local registrar, I should have been voting in my parents' hometown. The problem with that is I have never voted in my parents' hometown. I voted for Al Gore from my boarding school in high school. I spend less than 2 months a year in Arkansas, so why should I be participating in local elections there? With the help of a local attorney from the ACLU, I fought back. It was only after two lawsuits that I was able to register on a technicality that I am a member of the Virginia National Guard and Governor Mark Warner is my primary commander in chief."

Give me a break. Here is a kid that wants to participate in the system, and he has got to hire a lawyer from the ACLU to get a right to vote from the university.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And he is a National Guardsman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And he is a National Guardsman. The kid loves his country, loves the State of Virginia, has not been in Arkansas all that much, and they are trying to limit his right to vote.

I think that is the perfect example of why we are doing this, why we want to keep doing this, and slowly, over time, allow us to at least communicate to the young people of this country that sometimes it is a little bit of a fight. It should not be, but let them know that there are people here working on this for them.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is just amazing that you have to sue. I mean, it is amazing that you have to sue to participate in democracy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It would be funny if it was not so sad.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And the level of insight that went into the letter he received from an official office of saying not only do we think you do not reside in this State but you have your mom's car, and the last time you voted you were in another State. It is very, very important that Americans understand that we have to fight day in and day out, even within the borders of our own country, to make sure that our voices are heard. And young people they are getting it handed to them right now not only by the Federal Government but the State has to do the same thing because we have cut our commitment to them.

We will talk about spending money and spending irresponsibly. But I cut the gentleman off. He was about to head down a path that we are fully prepared to talk about this afternoon. But I want to encourage our listeners and watchers to go to rockthevote.com. I understand we are going to do some things in the 30-something Caucus to make sure that does not continue to happen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We will move on a little bit to the topic that we have been talking about a lot in the Committee on Armed Services and also been talking about a lot in Congress; and, obviously, the President of the United States has been talking about this a great deal.

Notice the picture that I have next to me. The gentleman on my far right, on the gentleman's far left, is President George Bush II. And on my near right here is Mr. Chalabi, who was the main informant, the main intelligence gatherer for the United States of America in leading to the war in Iraq.

The reason why we are going to talk about this is because some people may be asking, what are two 30-somethings that primarily have been focused on long-term debt for the country, increase in the deficit, annual deficits that we have in this country, student loans and college debt for students, debt for the country, debt for students, job access, outsourcing, we have talked about a lot of these issues, why are we going to talk about the war?

I think, and I know the gentleman knows this, that there has been nothing

that has damaged this country fiscally or with our political bank account more than the latest war in Iraq. I was against the war, as I am for full disclosure for the American people, for a lot of reasons that we are talking about today.

And I see that there are some young students that are up in the gallery now, so we actually have a live audience here. Why should they care about what is going on in Iraq?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to make references to visitors in the gallery.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Why should we talk about Mr. Chalabi? Why should we talk about his relationship to President Bush? Why should we talk about his relationship to Vice President CHENEY?

This gentleman stood up in the gallery during the State of the Union address as a friend of the President of the United States; and now we see in the paper today, from CNN's Inside Politics, Condoleezza Rice is now downplaying the relationship that this administration had with Mr. Chalabi. And she says, we had a relationship with Mr. Chalabi's Iraqi National Congress just like we have relationships with a number of Iraqi organizations devoted to the overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

That is not true. It is not just like every other relationship they had, because this gentleman was sitting in this gallery during the President's State of the Union address which, as we know, it is an honor to be recognized here in this Chamber, whether it is legally or illegally acknowledged. But he was acknowledged as a friend of the administration.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, obviously, he has represented himself as a friend of the United States. But there is a big discussion about him giving away the fact that we had Iran's secret codes and to be able to get intelligence on what they are doing inside Iran. Now that is major. That is major. That is just another investigation that is going on.

But how much did we pay him a month? Does the gentleman remember that number? Was it like \$365,000 a month? I believe that that was the number that they had. And if I can, I pulled my credit card out last time. I pulled it out of my wallet, and my wife said, do not pull that credit card out. And I told her I was using it as a prop.

But with a little help from my graphics people, when we start looking at this we are looking at really \$477 billion, which is \$4.7 trillion dollars in debt right now. And this is, of course, the U.S. Treasury that this money is coming out of.

So not only did we pay for a double spy to be able to share information with Iran, had a relationship, a very close relationship and family ties to Iran, which I must say that day in and day out we are trying to do what we

can to make sure that we play down the nuclear threat in the region, but we paid him. We paid him almost \$400,000 to provide this information.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. \$400,000 a month.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Almost \$400,000 a month. It is between 375 and 400. But when you are dealing with a \$4.7 trillion deficit, it seems like individuals that are in control of this House or the White House, they are not really concerned, or the Pentagon.

Now, I must say that it is important for us to remember that our credibility is at stake and American troops' lives are at stake. Any time we say that some folks stand behind our troops, we stand with our troops. And I will tell you right now that it is important that this information, that is bad information that we are getting from this gentleman, and also he is turning around and sharing our secrets with Iran. This is serious business, and this is nothing to play around with.

Just because we point these issues out, some may say, they are just being political. Let me tell you something. The lives that will be lost because of the information that has been shared with Iran and the information that we need to be able to fight the effort against terrorism, when it puts our troops' lives at stake, no one stops them, insurgents do not stop them and say, hey, let me ask you a question before we explode this improvised bomb here. Are you a Republican, Democrat or Independent?

□ 1700

Are you a male or a female or are you black or are you Hispanic or what have you? Are you partisan or Christian? Are you a Jew? They do not ask that question. They just carry out the act.

So we have decisions that are being made in the Pentagon, and I must say we have got to get to the whole resignation of the CIA Director, Mr. Tenet, and also what is not happening as it relates to Mr. Rumsfeld, who is kind of hard to find these days; but at the same time some of the bad decisions are still being made at the highest levels of the Pentagon. Everyone wants to get to the bottom of things, but no one wants to get to the top of it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is passionate about this. I think your performance on our committee has been a passionate performance, and I think it is important for the young people who are watching it or the C-SPAN viewers who are watching this to understand at how much of a disadvantage the next generation is going to be because of the acts of today, the amount of credibility that we lost in the world, the amount of negotiating power that we have lost in the world; and I am going to give a couple of examples and tie this into something that we were talking about before a few weeks ago.

We were talking a lot about China stealing our manufacturing in the

United States of America, how we are losing the manufacturing base in this country, and the majority of these jobs and companies are moving to China, exploiting the labor and human rights and everything else. How does that tie into this?

Because of the political capital that we have been expending on Iraq, we cannot deal with a greater threat, which is North Korea, which has increased their nuclear arsenal by 400 percent in the last 3 years. So because we are so bogged down in the Middle East right now, we have to ask China to deal with North Korea for us, and therefore, we cannot play tough with China on manufacturing. So this has helped us not to be able to deal with the erosion of the manufacturing base. It is the same with the oil prices.

OPEC is now saying they are going to turn the spigots on. We are not sure. We will believe it when we see it, but we have to ask Saudi Arabia to help us with our problems in the Middle East and Iraq, and we cannot talk tough with Saudi Arabia for the gasoline prices. So we have put ourselves at a weak bargaining position with China, weak bargaining position with the Saudis to deal with the oil crisis and the gas crisis in this country.

I want the American people who work two jobs and deal with their grandparents and their parents and people are sick and they are sending their kids to school, who do not have time to digest all of this, and I want them to understand that we have made bad political moves, and we hire Presidents and hire Members of Congress to put us in good political positions.

I heard many Members on the other side talk about Thomas Jefferson. Well, we bought the Louisiana territory. That was a good political position. It put the country in a good position. NASA put the country in a good position. For us to just sit here and watch our country be put in a weak position, a weak bargaining position, a weak negotiating position, all in the process of pulling out the credit card and dropping \$200 billion in the Middle East, which now we have to stay and win, no one's arguing that, we have to support our troops, and I know we both voted for the Defense authorization bill. So this is not pacifist. We do not want any war ever, and we are going to support the Defense spending in this country, the Defense appropriations. We both have voted for that.

All we are saying is bad decisions have been made and they have been made because we have been taking advice from a con man who has conned everybody for the last 25 or 30 years in the world, who was found guilty of 30-some counts in Jordan, fraud, embezzlement, has been running around the Middle East and running around Europe over the past years. Everyone knew the reputation of this man; and he just told this administration what they wanted to hear, and they bought it hook, line and sinker; and now we are stuck.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. I saw our con man on "Nightline" with Ted Koppel, and he said that he wanted to come before the Congress and address the Congress. He was willing to come to a congressional hearing. I am to the point that I will send him a ticket because I really want to see this one.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We will pay for the bus fare.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as you know, some of our troops secured the perimeter while Iraqi police went in and raided his office. This is the man we just cut payment off to in the last 30 days.

Also you mentioned outsourcing, and I just want, as it relates to this war and as it relates to the fight that we have tried to put on in the Committee on Armed Services, of making sure that our troops still get the things that they should have gotten when they first went in, armor, up-armorizing Humvees, making sure that they have the things that they need to have so they do not have to write home and say, Mom, Honey, can you send me some equipment, can you send me a bulletproof vest. I mean, all of these things that the U.S. military is supposed to provide but did not have on hand because we went at this war in haste.

You mentioned something about outsourcing, and I want to tell you, I think maybe at this juncture, maybe 4 years into the business of trying to run the country, that one would understand past mistakes. Well, it seems like the White House is at it again.

The White House announced yesterday, led by President Bush, that they just gave the largest technology contract for passport screening, the largest contract in the history of the Department of Homeland Security to a Bermuda company, a company that has turned in its U.S. passport, moved to Bermuda to skirt paying Federal corporate taxes to be able to help this country run. Those jobs have also been encouraged and will continue to stay offshore of the United States of America to be able to provide the very jobs that individuals are looking for.

I must be able to share with you that unless some amazing magic trick happens in the next 5 months, this President will be the first President in a very, very, very long time that has not gained not one net job, one-plus net job for U.S. citizens or individuals that are here in the United States of America. I just want to make sure that we understand. The American taxpayers are paying \$10 billion, okay, that is with a capital B, for the passport inspections to a company that has turned its own U.S. passports in and their bank account is offshore.

Yes, I am a Democrat; but you know something, there has to be a change, and when I said in the opening that the American people have to make a decision on when they get the opportunity, it is up to us to make sure they have

good information. This is not the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) saying, hey, what can we write to make it seem like we are right. This is straight out of the White House, and this was yesterday. It is not last week.

I encourage Americans, if you can, I do not have any stock in Time Warner, but please get this Time magazine that I am holding here, and I encourage Members of the Congress to grab a copy of this Time magazine.

I get Time in my office, and of course, the issue on obesity in America, I need to read that story, too, because I need to put down a few things. But there are a number of issues that we have been talking about in the Committee on Armed Services that I would like to talk about if we would have a public hearing for a change to be able to share with the American people about what is happening to our troops, what is happening for our troops and to be able to share with the rest of the world that we do care about the good, bad, and ugly that goes on in America, and we are able to address it.

I will tell you, I will continue and with your voice and other folks' voices, and I am so glad I was on this morning on the Washington Journal, on C-SPAN, with one of our Republican colleagues who concurs that we should have hearings about what is going on in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, our base where we are detaining insurgents, the al Qaeda individuals that are providing us the very information that we need to be able to save American troops' lives. I want to talk about the drug issue in Afghanistan that is also putting American troops' lives at risk.

So we cannot sit here and say, well, let us pass another resolution supporting the troops. No, we should not pass another resolution supporting the troops. The troops already know that we support them. We support them. There is no question. There is no great mystery in the Congress about who does not and who does support the troops. Everyone does.

The 5-year-old kids that are walking around in this building, if you ask them do they care about our military, I guarantee you nine times out of 10 and 99.9 percent, you are doggone right, I do. I look up to them. They are heroes and sheroes. They are in the community; they serve. They are Reservists that have been in Afghanistan and Iraq and other areas and the Horn of Africa where we are fighting the issue of terrorism.

Let me share with you a few things in the Time magazine this month. This is very interesting. It has a picture in here of children that are playing in front of a painting of the famous picture in Abu Ghraib prison where the individual has the wires hooked up to him, and I think it is important for the Committee on Armed Services and this House of Representatives, to the majority, that not only we get to the bottom of it, I am sick and tired of looking at sergeants and privates. We are

going to hold them accountable. We are going to court-martial. We are going to put them in jail, but how do we get to the culture of how the individuals felt comfortable in doing this? By us addressing the issue all the way up to the top, okay, and it is important that we do that.

I am talking about the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, who I did in committee thank him for his service to the country. He was a Member of this Congress, a two-term Secretary, serving his second term as Defense Secretary, but there becomes a point when you say, you know something, maybe I need to allow someone else to lead at this point, when we gave inaccurate information about weapons of mass destruction; when we gave inaccurate information as it relates to what is going to happen after the shock-and-awe campaign that was misleading; when we gave information of the fact that we were ready equipment-wise to go into Iraq for a year and 15 months, going on 2 years, all of our troops would have what they need.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, and that intelligence was based on information that they were getting from Chalabi, who is a known criminal. I mean, you are taking the country to war on intelligence, none has been true yet. We repeatedly hear: Saddam's ties to 9/11, treated as liberators, the whole list, use the oil revenue, whole list. All of that intelligence was wasted on information that we were getting from this guy. That is what is frustrating to me.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me just share with you a bid-for by the Defense Department, some \$360,000 on a monthly basis.

I tell you the reason why we will not have hearings here in the House, public hearings, about what is going on in this war is that no one has the right answers for what has actually happened today. Forget about the argument of yesterday. Let us talk about today.

There was a point when the Secretary of Defense could not answer in a straight way how many U.S. troops we had on the ground. Mr. Secretary, well, we have maybe, the indicators say maybe, you know, the rotation. We do not need to hear that. The American people need to know more about what is going on with this war.

Also, in Time magazine, I must add, Halliburton. So after all, now this e-mail appears because the cream will rise to the top, or the truth will, that Vice President DICK CHENEY did have something to do with the no-bid contract and Halliburton. It is not the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) report. Check out Time magazine, and here it is in black and white, an unclassified letter that was sent to the highest levels.

Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said, one of his superiors said it is fine, go ahead, move on it, it is being coordinated by the Vice President's office.

Let me share something with you. This is not small stuff. It is huge. The

whole outing of the CIA agent. This is huge. We had a young lady in harm's way, and in this White House somewhere she was outed, and then the President goes and talks to an attorney. It is not a good sign.

So I want to say that the American people have to really pay attention to what is going on. We are far beyond Democrat and Republican right now. We are far beyond that. American lives are at stake, and by the fact of us having these hearings, letting not only the world but the American people know that we are going to address prisoner abuse and that we are not going to allow it to happen because, guess what, we are not them. We are not the terrorists. We are not the insurgents. We are not individuals that are parking cars in front of buildings waiting on those cars to explode.

□ 1715

We do not gun down innocent people. We are the United States of America. We have to uphold the history and the integrity that our veterans have put forth in foreign lands and in this country of being men and women of honor and integrity. For individuals in shirts and ties to make decisions and then anyone that questions their decisions is considered helping the terrorists or being on the other side is really far beyond anything that I can remember. So I think it is important that the American people pick up that magazine.

Also, there is an article here talking about how we are in full retreat on our Iraq policy. But I think it is important that we understand that outsourcing in the White House is still going on, some of the bad decisions that are going on in the Pentagon, decisions that are being made and putting America's troops' lives at stake so that this Congress has to rise up. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the other body is being criticized by his colleagues, Republican colleagues, for having open hearings about what is happening wrong in Iraq. Something is fundamentally wrong with that. His having those hearings may help save American lives.

So I think it is important we have this open government. No one wants to give away secrets, but it is important to share this information with the people and the world to protect America's interests.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I think we need to add on to what my colleague just said, as we welcome our good friend from the great State of Alabama here with us, is that after 9/11, and we all have agreed that 9/11 was an intelligence failure. Everyone has agreed on that, regardless of party. So if you are in a position of power where you are about to go to war and you know that your intelligence apparatus has just failed the country completely, you would think that you would ask a million more questions. Not a hundred thousand, a million. And you would think you would be shaking

the intelligence community left and right to try to get accurate information. Instead, we were relying on a con man to get the information that we wanted to hear.

So what I do not understand is why, after a major intelligence failure, you do not try to rectify that problem by having and assuring that you have good intelligence. Not to make a minor decision, but to go to war and to send 140,000 troops to war. Why are you not making sure we have good intelligence?

I think that is something that maybe in many ways Members of Congress did not ask enough questions, the media did not ask enough questions, that we were not confrontational enough as to what the Iraqi policy was going to be.

We have been talking here for a while, so I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I am always glad to see my friends from Florida and Ohio with all the promise that you all represent for this institution.

Let me just share an anecdote with you and then talk about that for a moment. I was in rural Alabama, in my home district, about close to exactly a year ago now. It was mid-June of 2003. And I had the honor of being the commencement speaker at Judson College in Perry County, Alabama.

I remember a woman walked up to me after I had done the commencement speech, and she had tears in her eyes. I made the reasonable assumption that she was tearful because her child had graduated that day and they were tears of happiness. She walked up to me and said something that has stuck in my mind for the last year.

She said, "Mr. DAVIS, I have a husband who is in Iraq right now as a member of the Alabama National Guard, and our daughter did graduate today. My husband, her father, could not be here because he is serving our country." And then she went on to say, and she said it brokenly, in the midst of her tears, she went on to say, "Every morning I get up and I turn my television on CNN and I see the little crawler at the bottom of the screen, two Americans killed, three Americans killed." And she said, "Every morning, when I see that, something just jumps up from my stomach to my throat, and I remember that they always notify the next of kin before they make a release of the names. And that gives me relief for a moment. But until I see those names, I always have the lingering sense of dread."

That is what she said to me. Mind you, that was a year ago. That was before what has happened in April, it was before what has happened in May of this year, it was before Fallujah, it was before another 300 some Americans had lost their lives. That woman still gets up every morning, and I suspect if I ran into her tomorrow it would be the same conversation.

When you talk about Alabama, when you talk about one of the conservative States in this country, there is a myth in this city that people have made up their minds about the war. There is a myth in this city that people who live in the Alabamas of the world have made up their minds. Let me tell you, people in my State and I think people all around the south are searching for some wisdom. They are searching for some guidance. They want enough humility from this city and from the institutions of power in this city to recognize that we are struggling and we are trying to find our way.

These are not easy questions by any stretch of the imagination. We know the basics. We know that we have a significant investment of forces in a far-away land and that we are losing our men and women. We know that we have made a commitment, and we know that we are not a country that shirks from commitments once we make them. At the same time, we know that there are so many uncertainties. On June 30, there will be a transfer of power. We do not know what that transfer of power will beget.

As I have told so many people who live in my district, there should be no expectation on July 1 that soldiers will be drawn down, that large numbers of soldiers will leave. We do not know what will happen if this new government of 33 people is attacked or falls under siege in the next 6 months. We do not know what will happen if Iraq has elections and they elect a government that is hostile to the United States and we are invited to leave. What would we do at that point? What are our interests at this point in Iraq? Or to put it more basically, under what circumstances will we stay and under what circumstances will we begin to think about going?

Those are the questions that the people that you represent in south Florida and the people you represent in central Ohio and the people I represent in west and central Alabama are wondering about today. They are searching for a little bit of humility and a little bit of guidance.

There are two labels that get tossed around in this town a lot, pro-war and anti-war; and it strikes me that this, of all conflicts, this, of all foreign policy crises, may be a little too subtle for those simple terms.

Like you two gentlemen, and almost all of our colleagues, I spent Monday attending Memorial Day events. And on Monday morning in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, I had a chance to stand as close as I am to you right now in proximity to the widow of a gentleman who died in Iraq. His whole family was there. And something occurred to me. What do you say to a woman in that circumstance?

She really did not want to hear from me about politics. She really did not want to hear about Bush or Rumsfeld or Tenet. I do not know if she wanted to hear anything about policy or mat-

ters of state at all. But I do know that she wanted a little bit of comfort, a little bit of solace, a little bit of understanding.

There are so many families like that. That is what they want from us. They want some sense that we empathize with their pain.

And we do. There is not a one of us who sits in this institution who does not 100 percent support the men and women who are fighting there. Because at this point they are not fighting for a policy. They are fighting for survival. They do not pick up *The New York Times* to see if Bush is up or KERRY is up. They are simply trying to stay alive for a few more hours. And a lot of them, by the way, are younger than we are. We are three of the youngest people in this institution. A lot of these people are far younger than we are.

So the terms pro-war and anti-war, what do they mean? We have questions in this country, and what we need right now is a little bit of candor, and what we need is a little bit of direction. We have to get past this obsessive focus on personalities.

I, like most of you this afternoon, watched the news reports on George Tenet. I do not know the outgoing CIA Director. I do not know if you all do or not, but I do not know him. This does not seem to me to be about George Tenet. It did not seem to me to be about Condoleezza Rice when my fellow Alabamian testified before the 9/11 Commission. It did not seem to me to be about even Don Rumsfeld when we saw the excesses that happened at those prison camps. It is about something larger: What kind of country are we? What kind of values do we have? And how do we operate our institutions to reflect those values? Those are questions that are deeper and more abiding than anything that we are debating from day to day in the halls of public opinion and in the halls of this Congress.

So I would just say that what the people need from the President of the United States is enough humility to acknowledge that even the President does not know all the answers.

We are close to the 60th anniversary of Normandy, and I do not know how many of my colleagues know the story of the letter General Eisenhower wrote. General Eisenhower, as he was contemplating sending thousands of young men to their fate, wrote a letter that was meant to address a failure, a failure that he personally might not have survived. And the letter said something to the effect that this is my responsibility alone. If there is an error that has been made, it is my error.

That seems like more than 60 years ago. It seems like light years ago, sometimes, in this town. Because as you two know very well, sometimes we occupy a town where "I am sorry" is the last thing people will say. "I am responsible" is the last thing people will say. Or, at best, "I take responsibility" is what you say and not what you do.

So I think as we move deeper into this election year, as we contemplate the loss of life in Iraq, we all need to find some way to appeal to the better angels in our nature and some way to be true to our spirit and our values. And if we do that, we will find our way home, literally and figuratively. We will find our way to a policy that works for our country, a policy that is oriented in the best of our instincts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague.

The gentleman brought up General Eisenhower and spurred thoughts in my mind of the gentlemen of that day, of the Churchills and the Roosevelts and the Eisenhowers and the larger-than-life figures that participated in the greatest conflict. You just cannot help but to compare them to what the behavior is today. However, it just cannot be compared.

If we look at how Roosevelt handled himself and when we look at how Churchill not only stood up and gave his great Nation an enormous amount of confidence at a time when no one thought England would be able to stand tall, the big contrast I can recognize with Churchill and President Bush is in the preparation that Churchill gave and the leadership that London gave their people before anything was happening. This is going to be a long struggle, but in the end it will be our finest hour. We are not going to surrender. Churchill just kept saying, we are not going to surrender. If you take it, you are going to take it by us being knocked senseless onto the ground, was one of the great Churchill quotes. The preparation.

In this country, I think it was the exact opposite. We are going to be greeted as liberators. It is going to be great. Do not worry. It will be a drive-by war. We will use their oil. They are going to love us and hand us roses.

Yet when you look at the monumental figures of that era, who, like the gentleman said, kind of raised everybody's eyes up and tried to put the institutions in line with the values of the country, I really did not see that during this.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. And the difference is, if the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that in the 1930s and the 1940s the leaders of the world had a fair amount of confidence in the people that they served. Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt had a certain belief that the people they served were capable of rising to the occasion and that they would respond to candor and common sense.

□ 1730

Sometimes in this television soundbite era that we live in, we do not have enough confidence in the people of our country. We have a mind-set that we cannot tell the people in our country full information, and that we cannot let them know a commitment may be a

long one because they may not have faith. We cannot let them know the money is going to be three times what we say it is because they may not have faith. We cannot let them know all of these uncertainties because we fear they may not have faith.

I have spent a fair amount of time in my life trying cases before juries, and I have won them and I have lost them; but I can confidently tell Members that every jury that I have ever appeared in front of I felt did the right thing in terms of what the facts were, whether it was what I advocated or not. I have that same kind of faith in the American people, that if we tell the American people the facts, I have confidence in our ability to apply those facts to policy and to apply our values to those policies; and maybe we need more of a sense of confidence. Maybe if the administration had had more confidence in the quality of our people, we would have had a clearer, more accurate path painted on where we are going in Iraq.

We all know from the work both of you do, we know there is a reason why certain facts were not emphasized. What was the old saying from the movie, you cannot handle the truth, a movie back in the 1990s, there was a feeling and fear that maybe the people just could not handle the truth. I do not know about other Members, but I think they can.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure hearing the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) and what the gentleman brings to the table as it relates to philosophy and history. Part of our democracy is making sure we level with the American people, the good, bad and ugly. They need to know because they need to be able to prepare themselves.

The President recently asked Americans to make the sacrifice that they made in World War II, make the sacrifice that they made in World War I and other conflicts, some of the great wars that have taken place; but it was a different approach to those wars. We planned; we made sure that individuals had equipment. We made sure that we had a strategy going in and coming out.

There was a Senator from Missouri, a junior Senator during World War II. His name was Harry S Truman. He had a select committee that was dealing with contracting, dealing with the needs of World War II at that particular time; and he did what he had to do during a time of war. During the time of World War II, they had a number of hearings to make sure that the troops had what they needed and they were able to respond real-time to issues that were coming up during that war.

For us to say, well, we do not have time to do that, we should not question the Pentagon about things that they are doing, we are muzzled as a Congress. Not to clear my conscience, not to say this needs to be said, but when the annals of history are reflected upon, I want to make sure that those of

us on this side of the aisle, that we did everything that we could to give the facts as we see them printed in documents.

A Pentagon report recently released said 25 percent-plus lives could have been saved if we had the right equipment at the right time.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, that sparks another thought I had which I think is worth noting. There was another principle that those leaders had, and it was the principle of sacrifice. They had the moral authority and the willingness to say to this country this cause is so mighty, we have to sacrifice.

Contrast that with about a year ago. We were here when all three of us very strongly felt if we were going to continue to have to pay the cost of the war in Iraq and have to bear that burden, maybe it was time to suspend the tax cut for just the top 1 percent of Americans, or maybe just for people earning more than \$1 million, and pay for the war and occupation with that money. Now that is sacrifice. It is proportionate sacrifice. It is going to those most able to bear it instead of those least able to bear it, and you are saying that our cause is so strong and righteous we are going to come to the American people and ask them to forgo something. It would have meant something a year ago if the President had done that. If the President had come to the body and said, I care so deeply about this cause, I am willing to abandon one of my own programs, I am willing to walk away from this tax cut for people earning a million dollars a year or more, not because I want to, but because this is a time of sacrifice.

That kind of inspiration I think would have moved this country and would have produced an overwhelming response from people on both sides of the aisle. But somehow we have entered a zone where we talk the language of sacrifice at Memorial Day events and events around the country, and we will talk the language again on the Normandy anniversary on June 6; we talk the language of sacrifice, but we run from the substance of sacrifice.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure, because I was on the floor last night with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the Congressional Black Caucus, and I shared that I was at the World War II memorial with my mother and uncle, who is a Korean War veteran. They asked for all of the veterans to stand up. A number of them stood up. Those individuals that could not stand up, they put their hands up. I could not help but think "America the Beautiful" playing in the background, planes flying over, what was going to be their reality on Tuesday, when they go to the VA to try to receive services, the reality of calling for help and having to wait 6 months to see an eye doctor.

When we start looking at how we treat our veterans and how we respond

to them, the gentleman mentioned the deficit, and I am going to say we had this credit card made up. This is the U.S. Treasury credit card, Republican Congress. That is a big number, \$477 billion. That is a lot of money. That is an awful lot of money. And we look at, hopefully, the expiration date is good through 11/04 so we can get a new majority in here to be able to do something truly about the deficit. I appreciate the gentleman's work on that committee and on the Committee on the Budget to talk about true fiscal responsibility. And I will say it is important on the Committee on Armed Services, on behalf of troops and what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) has just shared with us, families, we watch the news without even worrying about a family member, will their name scroll across the screen. Will they become a picture in the wall in the backdrop of a newscast. We have that privilege of not worrying, but we have individuals not based on the troop decisions, and many of the individuals on the ground, but the decisions that are made right here in Washington, D.C. that are endangering the lives of American troops.

We are going to support them, and we want to make sure that they have the equipment that they need to have; but if we do not do our job here in this Congress in giving voice to the voices, giving voice to that Reservist and that family that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) talked about where the father could not see the graduation of his own daughter, but he is fighting for the very freedom she is celebrating right now.

Do Members know why the President would not say, I am going to sacrifice one of my own programs? Because, guess what, he is never wrong. I am sorry to say it, he is never wrong. He never says, hey, I am wrong. The only thing he says, and we need to watch this word, and I need the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) to share some of the things we discussed earlier, but when we hear that somebody is doing a superb job, watch out.

The President today said, George Tenet, and I must say after the President stood up here in the well and said we believe that Iraq has received the necessary materials they need to make a nuclear weapon, and then once we found out that was inaccurate information, he was prepared to throw George Tenet under the bus, and now he said he has done a superb job. That sounds like the same thing he said about his Secretary of Defense. It is not a personal thing, but it is an issue of decisions. Especially when you are appointed and not elected, you have to make the decision if the leader does not take the prerogative to make the right decision and say, you know something, thank you for your service. In an honorable way, we will give you a gold watch and we appreciate your service. But he is saying nothing at all. That is what inflames insurgence on American troops.

I will leave it at that.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is another historical point worth making. None of us were here, we were all too young, but we have all read about the Bay of Pigs in 1961 in Cuba. For some of the younger people listening that do not know what the Bay of Pigs was, it was a failed effort to invade Cuba back in 1961. Lives were lost, and it was seen as a dismal policy mistake. John Kennedy had every reason politically to say this was a plan conceived by the previous President. He had every reason to say that this was something my CIA director foisted on me, this was something I did not want to do, and the military pushed it down my throat. He could have fired a number of people.

President Kennedy said something that is worth repeating. He said, "I am the responsible officer of the government. Defeat is an orphan, victory has a thousand fathers." That rings across the last 43 years. Defeat is always an orphan. It is something that happened. I did not do it; it happened. It is always something that no one wants to claim. Whereas victory, everyone wants to share in that and say, I did my part, you did your part.

We come back again to the same place. What I think so many of our people want is enough humility from up high, enough humility from the throne that we can conceive the possibility of error.

World War II is a wonderful analogy. We got some things wrong in World War II. The greatest President of all time, in my opinion, Franklin Roosevelt, signed the order that led to the internment of Japanese Americans. A Supreme Court that consisted of some of the finest jurists we have ever had approved that internment of Japanese Americans. We all know that was perfectly wrong now.

If men as great as Franklin Roosevelt and Robert Jackson and Hugo Black could be that wrong, maybe it should occur to us today that some of the individuals who sit in circles in power today could be wrong. Again, there is a lesson about humility to be learned there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was just enjoying listening to the gentlemen talk. I want to clean up a couple of things that were mentioned. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) mentioned that now we want to make sure that our soldiers have the equipment that they need, we want to make sure that the vehicles are up-armored and they have the vests and the plates to go into the vests and everything else.

We have gotten so caught up in the fact that we want to get it to them, we forget to ask, you are telling me we went to war and we did not have our troops properly equipped? Lack of preparation.

In the Defense appropriations bill that we just passed out of the House, we reimbursed parents or whoever for

people, parents who paid for vests for their kids. I mean, you have to be kidding me. We had to reimburse parents that paid for their protective vests for soldiers in Iraq.

The general that testified about the prison abuse said that there were a couple of problems, major problems. One, lack of training. One, lack of supervision. To me, after almost 2 years on the Committee on Armed Services and a layman, civilian, lack of training and lack of supervision to me means we do not have enough troops there. If you are not training them properly, you do not have enough people to train; and if you are not supervising them properly, you do not have enough people to supervise. I think that is basic common sense to say this group has not prepared us for this war.

One other thing I would like to say because some young people are probably sitting at home listening to this, remember as soon as President Clinton got in office, there were always investigations, investigating this, Travelgate, Nannygate, this gate and that gate. They were always investigating the man. Why? The House and the Senate were Republican. The White House was Democrat. We are now in a one-party rule system. The House is controlled by the Republicans, the Senate is controlled by the Republicans, the White House is controlled by Republicans. I am not saying that they are always wrong, and I am not saying that we are always right. All I am saying is when there is one-party rule, we cannot subpoena people out of this House because the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) from the Committee on Government Reform is not the chairman of the committee.

□ 1745

If he was the Chair of the committee, we could subpoena some of these people who wear the suits and bring them before committees in the House and have them sit and tell us what happened and why and make sure we are starting to hold people responsible for their actions.

That is just what I want to say to the American people, is you cannot have one party rule the whole government. It is unhealthy for the institutions; it is unhealthy for the country.

There is no balance right now. There is no one overseeing what is going on. We get fed a line from somebody like this, and no one can stand up and question it. That is not a good way to run your country. This country was founded on all the different aspects, the branches and everything else, in order to bring some balance to these institutions we have.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience, and to

refer to other Members in debate only in the third person, by State designation.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JUNE 8, 2004

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 8, 2004.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

THE CASE FOR A SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, "China is a sleeping giant. Let her lie and sleep, for when she awakens, she will astonish the world," wrote Napoleon Bonaparte. I would like to title this speech "The Case for a Special Relationship With China."

Great nations almost always miss important changes outside their world. Such errors threaten their future in ways they never dreamed. History also has examples of leaders who saw challenges early and responded well.

The leaders of Great Britain's late empire entirely missed the rise of the United States. Britain suffered years of combat in World Wars I and II before their American allies joined the fight. During both wars, the British Empire teetered in the balance. Conversely, President Truman wisely perceived his challenge in the Soviet Union and responded well. His actions contributed mightily to the winning of the Cold War.

In the 19th century, not everyone missed the rise of the United States. As early as 1835, Alexander de Tocqueville saw in the future clearly when he wrote, "Americans are already able to make their flag respected. In a few years, they will be able to make it feared."

Looking from Westminster across the Thames River in 1870, the British Empire's leaders did not share de Tocqueville's view. It was an easy mistake for them to make. Queen Victoria presided over the largest economic block on Earth. In the glare of an empire where the sun never set, her ministers largely ignored the significance of their American cousins.

Well-schooled leaders of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office were distracted by a number of small wars at

the fringe of their empire, Abyssinia, South Africa, Egypt and Sudan, to name a few. In 1868, The Illustrated London News warned, "We can ill afford a perpetual succession of little wars," but few took notice. European continental leaders were equally unaware of the American change that was under way in their century. German Chancellor Bismarck discounted the United States when he wrote, "There is a providence that protects fools, drunkards, children and the United States of America."

After only one single Victorian generation, America's economy grew to be twice the size of Britain's. By 1900, many of the British Empire's leaders dimly perceived the threat from Germany but remained unaware of how their world had changed across the Atlantic. It was hard for many leaders to take America seriously when Belgium's Armed Forces outnumbered the U.S. Army.

As a result of their ignorance, England's leaders entered the First World War without the backing of the American arsenal. In 3 short years, from 1914 to 1917, they exhausted the wealth of the empire. Finally, America joined the allies of World War I, but only on President Wilson's terms. It took British leaders two generations of conflict to understand how important America had become to them.

Today, London's policy towards the United States is rightfully called the "special relationship." Are there changes under way which call for American attention? Could the leaders of America's foreign policy make a similar mistake? In our vision of America's future, are there any countries deserving another special relationship?

Our history is filled with examples of countries where economic growth rapidly turned into political and military power. The rise of Japan, Germany and even some Gulf states show that economic expansion has an inevitable political and military impact. For the United States to be effective in foreign policy, the President needs advisers who see the world not just as it is but as it will become. When the White House advisers fail to outline strategic change, they doom our President to using short-term expedience to cope with a long-term threat.

With a clear strategic view, the advisers of President Truman served our country well. Writing his famous long telegram from the rubble of 1946 Moscow, U.S. Foreign Service Officer George Kennan correctly outlined the emerging threat from the Soviet Union. By removing President Roosevelt's friendly "Uncle Joe" veneer from Stalin, George Kennan warned his President clearly about the coming Cold War. The Soviet Union, in his view, was becoming a colossus, demanding more than short-term American expedience. The struggle between East and West could only be won with a strategic plan by the West.

Truman's answer to the challenge of the Cold War was massive. He backed

his short-term military defense of South Korea with a long-term set of new institutions: the Marshall Plan, the Central Intelligence Agency, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the World Bank, the Strategic Air Command, the United Nations and the Voice of America, to name a few.

After four decades of struggle, the East abandoned the Berlin Wall. In the heady days after communism's fall, many felt the U.S. stood unopposed at the dawn of a new Pax Americana. Francis Fujiyama asked in the Washington Post, "is this the end of history?"

History hardly ended, but the idea of American supremacy is now strong. America's Armed Forces won stunning victories: 1991 in Kuwait, 1995 in Bosnia, 1999 in Kosovo and 2003 in Iraq. Who can challenge America?

Despite our ascendancy, we must ask the question, is there a major change in the world for which the U.S. should prepare? As Truman did in the 1940s, should the United States create institutions that respond to this change?

The American view of foreign policy has more to do with our European past than our Asian present. By a two-to-one margin, Americans believe that our policy towards Europe is more important than Asia, but our trade with Asia surpassed Europe a generation ago. Today, American trade with Asia totals 50 percent more than our trade with Europe. The U.S. State Department has just 579 full-time Americans stationed in Asia, compared to over 1,300 in Europe and the countries of the former Soviet Union. Asian economies are both larger and growing faster than Europe. Beyond the Asian Tigers of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, the growth rates of China and India clearly show that most of our history in the 21st century will be written in Asia.

One country looms large across the future of the United States, China. China's absence from the first rank of world powers is a historical anomaly. Throughout recorded history, the Chinese people were responsible for many of the advances of modern society: paper, gunpowder, even spaghetti.

Seventy years before Columbus, China's famous explorer, Admiral Cheng Ho, mapped much of the Arab world from a ship that was twice the size of the Santa Maria. But for the Emperor's decision to recall the fleet, China would have discovered Europe, not the other way around.

As recently as the 1830s, China produced one-third of the Earth's wealth. Most of her advances and talent were squandered by corrupt governments, wars and a Chinese dictatorship. Despite a massive population and storied culture, China declined into socialist poverty. Under Mao, the Chinese people lost two generations of progress and were home to the worst famine of the 20th century. But following Mao Zedong's death, Deng Xiaoping led a Chinese economic reform of historic

proportions. It is very difficult for many Americans today to understand the breadth and scope of this historic change.

When we accurately look at today's China, we note it produces more steel than the United States, consumes twice the grain of the United States, has built highways twice the length of Germany and France combined, graduates three times the number of engineers as India, and is home to over 200 million cable TV subscribers. It replaced Mexico as America's number two trading partner, and it replaced America as Japan's number one trading partner. There are 200 cities with populations over 1 million, and the economy doubles every 8 years. We now estimate that its economy will be larger than the United States in the next decade.

China is not only growing year to year, it has sustained a growth rate of over 9 percent annually for a generation. Given the difference in price of many domestic goods in China, economists now debate how to measure the size of the Chinese economy, using a traditional gross domestic product or a more up-to-date purchasing power parity to take into account the lower cost of Chinese domestic goods.

Either way, the effect of China's sustained growth has profound proportions. Under a GDP measurement, the United States economy now stands at \$11 trillion, whereas China's economy stands at only \$1.5 trillion; but using purchasing power parities, our \$11 trillion economy stands next to China's \$7 trillion economy.

Using purchasing power measurements, the International Monetary Fund projects China will be home to the world's largest economy as early as 2007, during the next American President's administration. Koishi Ishiyama recently wrote that China's rise can be compared to the Shock and Awe operation in Iraq.

Foreign direct investment did not significantly exist in China before 1980, and while such investment in all other developing countries fell in 2002, it rose by 15 percent in China, netting \$52 billion in new investments.

The pace of China's growth is also accelerating. In the next 10 years, the City of Beijing will double its supply of housing. The Chinese highway system and the number of cable TV subscribers will also double in size. While this change is dimly seen in official Washington, it is having a profound effect on the Chinese people.

China's hosting of the 2008 Olympic games will be one of many upcoming international events in China. China last year became the third country on Earth to orbit a human in one of its own space vehicles.

□ 1800

Next year, China plans to orbit a two-man vehicle, the *Shenzhou VI*, on its way to building its own space station and lunar rover.

China's progress can be overstated. Over 200 million Chinese still live on less than \$1 a day. There is a great gap now opening between the poorer western provinces of China and the new-found wealth of China's east coast. Environmental challenges also loom, including over 100 of China's cities with air pollution exceeding the World Health Organization's guidelines for sulfur dioxide.

The World Bank's World Development Report still ranks China at number 76 out of 129 countries measured for personal income; and despite progress, the World Bank estimates that Chinese per capita income totals just \$1,000 per year.

Such low numbers, though, hide profound progress. Between 1978 and 1998, the World Bank estimates the number of poor people in the world fell by 8 million. The number of people who were poor outside China actually rose by 82 million. But the world's total numbers were compensated by the profound reduction in Chinese poverty. From 1978 to 1999, Chinese adult illiteracy fell from 37 percent to 17 percent, while infant mortality dropped from 41 per live births in 1978 to 30 in 1999.

Changes in China had an impact on Americans as well. Motorola now employs over 10,000 people in China and owns the country's best-recognized trademark. By last year, over 1,500 U.S. firms invested \$25 billion in China. One U.S. corporate executive advised the Congress that his top three issues in Washington were China, China, and China.

The story of Wal-Mart shows the profound change that is under way both in China and in the United States. Unlike traditional retailers such as Sears Roebuck or J.C. Penney, Sam Walton recognized the importance of China and the advantage of its lower-cost merchandise. Relying heavily on Chinese suppliers, Wal-Mart grew to become America's largest employer. Selling in nearly every town in America, Wal-Mart doubled its purchases of Chinese goods to \$12 billion per year. And last year, Wal-Mart sold 10 percent of everything that China made. In many ways, the face of all-American Wal-Mart is really the face of China, Incorporated.

There are many examples of how China's transformation influenced America's private sector. Like British merchant bankers who understood America's rise and bankrolled the Union Pacific Railroad, companies like Boeing, General Electric, Baker MacKenzie, and hundreds of other U.S. private sector interests understand what is happening and are risking a great deal to capitalize on the opportunities presented by the rise of China.

But this understanding is not well understood by America's government. Like their British Government forefathers that missed America's rise, there is little evidence that the Federal Government perceives or is moving to realign the world to the rise of

China. Many European powers discounted turn-of-the-century America and its puny Armed Forces. Many Americans likewise dismissed the capabilities of the People's Liberation Army and its potential to change the course of Asian history. By China's own plan, military modernization ranks fourth in their list of four modernizations.

Following the recent victories of America's Armed Forces, the raw size of a country's army is no longer evidence of its future prowess in battle. The People's Liberation Army, numbering 2.4 million, still stands as the world's largest; but it looks anachronistic and unable to enforce the will of China's leaders very far from its borders.

A Council on Foreign Relations Task Force under former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown estimated last year that China was "at least 2 decades behind the United States in terms of military technology and capability." According to the Pentagon, Chinese military leaders closely studied NATO's operation over Kosovo and described it as the first "no-contact" war.

In the post-Cold War world, Deng Xiaoping gave a key directive to the Chinese security establishment based on his "24-character strategy" and that was, "keep cool-headed to observe. Be composed to make reactions. Stand firmly. Hide our capabilities. Bide our time. Never try to take the lead, and be able to accomplish something."

While seeking short-term opportunities with the United States, the Pentagon reported, "China's leaders assert the United States seeks to maintain a dominant strategic position while containing the growth of Chinese power, ultimately dividing and Westernizing China."

Much of China's military budget and plans were influenced by scenes of conflict in the Balkans and Iraq played out on televisions tuned to the 24-hour news channels. After the U.S. victory in Kosovo, China's leaders seriously considered upgrading the fourth-ranked priority they attach to their military. The army developed a new response doctrine called the "Three Attack and Three Defenses," focusing on attacking stealth aircraft, cruise missiles and helicopters, while defending against precision strikes, electronic warfare, and enemy reconnaissance. Chinese Air Force chief of staff Lieutenant General Zheng Shenxia noted that without adopting a preemptive doctrine, the chances of a PLA victory are limited.

In November 2002, China overhauled its Politburo Standing Committee, the center of the Chinese Government decision-making. Every member of the politburo was replaced except Hu Jintao. Following this shakeup, senior leaders reaffirmed their emphasis on economic growth, but did increase funding for military modernization. Acknowledging its weakness in the face of such

complete U.S. victories, Chinese leaders tempered their sense of vulnerability, knowing that unlike Kosovo, China is a nuclear power. Its 2002 defense White Paper, in contrast to its 2000 White Paper, did not explicitly criticize U.S. deployments in Asia.

The main mission of the Chinese military is to fight and win a conflict over Taiwan. In March 2002, Chinese Finance Minister Xiang Huaicheng announced a 17.5 percent increase in its official defense spending. While China reports an official defense budget of approximately \$20 billion, its actual spending ranges to twice or three times that level, totaling \$45 billion to \$67 billion annually. The Department of Defense and the Council on Foreign Relations both estimate that annual spending in real terms could increase three to four-fold over the levels I just quoted by 2020. Most defense modernization spending occurs outside the public defense budget.

Chinese military spending in this range roughly equals the \$65 billion spent by Russia and dramatically exceeds the \$43 billion Japanese defense budget or the \$38 billion British military budget. A three-fold increase in spending by China would put their military budget above all other nations, except the United States.

China's rising military budget masks a structural problem in its military. Since large armies no longer guarantee success, China has cut the size of her armed forces from 1997 to 2000 by reducing 500,000 men, including 11 percent of her naval personnel, 12 percent of her air force personnel, and 18 percent of her army personnel. Sixty of 100 maneuver divisions were collapsed into the remaining structure of 40 divisions and 40 brigades. The air force retired older aircraft, dropping from over 5,000 aircraft at the end of the 1990s to 3,500 now. Of the remaining aircraft, only 150 are modern fourth-generation fighters. China still regards its military as too "infantry-heavy" with an army so large as to "impede rapid deployment and equipment modernization."

By reducing the size of the armed forces, China provided funding dedicated to military modernization. The air force is adding advanced SU-30MKK fourth-generation fighter aircraft, AA-12/ADDER active-radar guided air-to-air missiles, and a new SU-30 naval variant capable of carrying air-launched, anti-shipping cruise missiles. The Navy added four SOVREMENNY-class guided missile destroyers and produced its own new designer SONG-class diesel-electric submarines, the first with quieter skewed propellers. It took delivery of four quiet KIL0-class diesel-electric submarines and has another eight submarines under contract, all equipped with a new 3M-54E Novator Alpha anti-shipping cruise missile. Given the sum of investment and rapid modernization, China did forgo one important upgrade, and her navy has now shelved plans for its own aircraft carrier.

The pace of development accelerated for China's army. The land forces are developing a light tank, an amphibious tank, and an amphibious-armored personnel carrier, all added to over 1,500 type-96 main battle tanks that are already delivered. This kind of new equipment is now flowing to China's revamped three airborne and two marine brigades.

The Ministry of Defense now emphasizes recruitment, retention, and more training for officers and key NCOs. Training now emphasizes small-scale specialized maneuvers under the new doctrine of fighting a limited war under high-tech conditions. All infantry divisions now have armor, up from only half in 1997.

Since 1989, China has been cut off from most U.S. and European military technology. Its defense establishment cannot innovate as fast as it could if it had access to foreign equipment. China's leaders responded with a foreign policy emphasizing cooperation and good relations with the United States. Over time, such a strategy could reopen their access to key Western technologies, even in the military field.

The transformation of China's new military power is clearest in its missile force. China maintains a limited force, including 20 nuclear missiles capable of hitting targets in the United States. A number of U.S. Government agencies project that this rise in the missile force will lift by a factor of three to over 60 missiles capable of striking the United States, using the new CSS-4 Mod 2 ICBM. This Chinese force will be augmented by the brand-new solid-fuel DF-31 ICBM and an entirely new generation of Chinese nuclear submarines, the 094-class, carrying a naval variant of the DF-31. China is also developing two other classes of solid-fuel intercontinental ballistic missiles. It is also developing a heavy-lift space launch vehicle, capable of lifting 25 tons into low orbit by 2007.

These developments pale when compared to China's expanding arsenal of medium-range missiles all aimed at Taiwan. China currently has a force of 450 such missiles and is adding 75 each year. Beyond large nuclear additions to China's armed forces, China places a very high priority on information warfare. The PLA believes that the U.S. Department of Defense is too dependent on networks that are vulnerable to attack. By attacking these systems, planners in China's army believe the U.S. forces could be degraded "anonymously."

The anonymity of information attacks could play a key role even now. The House of Representatives recently reported regular attempts by computer systems located in China to enter the main computer server of the House Committee on Armed Services. The Pentagon may have referred to this when it recently reported that China "places unusual emphasis on a host of new information warfare forces instead of information superiority and the sys-

tem of systems approaches popular in the United States."

□ 1815

There have been several official references about leveraging China's growing presence on the Internet, including references to a "people's war" in "net warfare", suggesting a stronger role in nationalist hacking.

China also has a commitment to electronic warfare equaled only by the United States. Unlike many countries now totally dependent on U.S. leadership in this exotic field, China is developing electronic jamming aircraft for several variants and may have several programs to develop escort jammers on transports, tactical aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicle platforms. It has equipped the Su-30 with anti-radiation missiles that work on the same principle of U.S. weapons that were so crucial to our own victories. China's anti-radiation missile, the FT-2000, is described in their sales brochures as an "AWACS killer." The PLA is also producing state-of-the-art technology to improve intercept, direction finding and jamming. It may also be producing jammers for use against America's most successful weapon, the satellite-guided JDAM munition that so accurately uses the U.S. Global Positioning System.

Their efforts also include producing laser weapons, such as the man-portable ZM-87, advertised for blinding human vision and electro-optical sensors, radio-frequency weapons and possibly a ground-based anti-satellite weapon. They have also invested considerably in developing short- and medium-range unmanned aerial vehicles, including an unmanned combat aerial vehicle.

According to the Chinese military publication Junshi Wenzhai, China has already produced an "Assassin's Mace" or trump card to counter U.S. superiority in the Western Pacific. One article identifies five major, quote, Assassin's Maces, unquote, including fighter bombers, submarines, anti-ship missiles, torpedoes and mines designed to destroy foreign aircraft carriers. These systems would be backed by new research by China on other technologies, including kinetic energy and low-observable platforms.

This research can be accelerated by acquiring foreign technologies such as the recent activities of two Chinese students at universities collecting information on Terfenol-D, an invention of the U.S. Department of Energy's Ames laboratory.

These developments show that China's growing economic power may already be translating into military power. It is clear that most large American companies already perceive the size and importance of China. What is not clear is if the U.S. Government has made a similar intellectual leap to understand the new geography of the 21st century.

In 2002, the U.S. State Department conducted a major study of the needs

of the U.S. Government in China. The Beyond China 2000 Action Plan cut 55 people from permanent U.S. Government desks in China. The State Department's Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs noted the decision reflected, quote, hard-nosed decisions, unquote. Congress recently ordered the State Department to review the future needs of the U.S. Government in China by 2010. In its February report, it is difficult to see what measures the State Department used to justify reducing the size of the U.S. Government in China.

In 1975, the new U.S. liaison officer in Beijing under Ambassador George Herbert Walker Bush, who later became president, processed 651 non-immigrant visas to the United States. In 2003, U.S. consular officers handled 320,000 such applications. From a handful, the number of Chinese students rose to over 60,000 in the U.S. last year.

Only 38 Americans registered with the Beijing liaison office in 1975. Today, over 3,600 Americans are registered in addition to over 1 million American tourists visiting China each year. The State Department admitted to Congress noting that staffing in the U.S. embassy in Beijing and the Consulates General is currently inadequate to the growing workload.

The workload of the U.S. Government in China is growing for other reasons. In 2001 alone, China joined the international coalition against terrorism, the World Trade Organization, hosted the Asian-Pacific Economic Conference, and won the bidding of the 2008 Olympic games. These issues came in addition to key concerns regarding nuclear nonproliferation, human rights, intellectual property, and religious freedom.

The State Department projects that the number of U.S. Government agencies wishing to station personnel permanently in China will rise from 12 agencies to over 20 by 2010. Several agencies, including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, developed but then halted plans to deploy in China. The United States broke new ground on a new embassy complex last February. With the new embassy, the State Department plans only a modest increase in official Americans stationed in China from 960 to 1,200.

Plans to expand America's eyes and ears in China do not depend only on the size of our embassy in Beijing. They also depend on increasing the number of Americans in the diplomatic service who can master a very difficult language. In 2000, the State Department launched its China 2000 Initiative. The mission of the Initiative was to develop infrastructure to meet the projected physical and human needs, including language. This Initiative is very small, modestly increasing the number of Chinese students in the State Department annually from only five to only 15. The Initiative also includes some advanced training for just five students in Beijing and a mail program for lessons to

only 30 other students to maintain Chinese language proficiency.

Such efforts appear grossly inadequate compared to China's central role in the 21st century. With the largest trade surplus, the largest economy, the largest military budget outside the United States, China deserves a special relationship with the United States.

In November, 2002, a task force under Japan's Prime Minister Koizumi released their report designating China as Japan's top foreign policy priority for the future. The decision makes sense for Japan but, given China's growth, its position on the U.N. Security Council, and the future size of its economy, it may make sense for the United States to do this as well.

Our country has been the home of the world's largest economy for 130 years, but that is about to change; and this change will be one of the most profound shifts of the new century. There was a time early in the history of the United States when our national income was not at the top of the international heap. Today, under our Pax Americana, it may be difficult for us to reconnect with our forefathers and mothers who were forced to depend only on diplomacy in the face of very long odds.

Avidly, we retell parts of U.S. history, the Revolution, the Civil War, and the victories of World War I and II, all to stoke American pride; and these examples are used to confirm the superiority of our own ideals. But American history has less-well-known examples of when we struggled without our traditional advantage in material and money.

I put this question to the House, when was the last time that U.S. Armed Forces faced a military from a country whose economy was larger than our own? One summer day in August, 1814, comes to mind. British soldiers and marines marched on in Washington in one of the last acts of the War of 1812. U.S. forces met them in what we now call the Battle of Bladensburg. The battle went so badly for the Americans that British called it the "Bladensburg races" because U.S. forces ran away so quickly. Britain's 85th Foot Regiment still displays eagle-flagged standards of two American regiments captured that day. The following day British forces burned the Capitol and Executive Mansion to the ground.

History reminds us that the United States has not and will not always be the Nation on Earth with the largest economy. With an America of unquestioned commercial dominance, we can afford to make diplomatic mistakes. In a world where America holds fewer cards, we cannot afford miscalculation.

We are quickly nearing a world in which China will play a central role in the diplomatic life of the United States. British diplomats before the world wars would have scoffed at the notion of their American cousins playing a central role in world politics. Let

us hope that the new American diplomats of the 21st century understand how quickly the post Cold War world has changed.

Our President Truman set the record of his time for being an unpopular president. In 1946, he stood at just 32 percent in the polls. Thankfully, he steeled his heart and made the tough decisions needed to design a successful campaign through the Cold War against the Soviet Union. America and freedom won the Cold War without fighting World War III.

When we look towards the 21st century and China's coming role in its history, will our leaders lay the foundation for America's diplomatic success? I ask that question to the House tonight.

And I thank Reed Bundy of my staff for helping me prepare these remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family medical reason.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of a family emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, June 9.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, June 9.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1721. An act to amend the Indian Land Consolidation Act to improve provisions relating to probate of trust and restricted land, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the Allied landing at Normandy during World War II.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 2004, at 12 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE—MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 108th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

STEPHANIE HERSETH, South Dakota At Large.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Anibal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, Tammy Baldwin, Frank W. Ballance, Jr., Cass Ballenger, J. Gresham Barrett, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Bob Beauprez, Xavier Becerra, Chris Bell, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Michael

Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, Sherwood Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono, John Boozman, Madeline Z. Bordallo, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Allen Boyd, Jeb Bradley, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Ginny Brown-Waite, Michael C. Burgess, Max Burns, Richard Burr, Dan Burton, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Benjamin L. Cardin, Dennis A. Cardoza, Brad Carson, Julia Carson, John R. Carter, Ed Case, Michael N. Castle, Steve Chabot, Ben Chandler, Chris Chocola, Donna M. Christensen, Wm. Lacy Clay, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Tom Cole, Mac Collins, Larry Combest, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jerry F. Costello, Christopher Cox, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Philip M. Crane, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, Jim Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Tom Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Tom DeLay, Jim DeMint, Peter Deutsch, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Calvin M. Dooley, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Jennifer Dunn, Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Rahm Emanuel, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Lane Evans, Terry Everett, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Tom Feeney, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, Ernie Fletcher, Mark Foley, J. Randy Forbes, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Vito Fossella, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Martin Frost, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Richard A. Gephardt, Jim Gerlach, Jim Gibbons, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Paul E. Gillmor, Phil Gingrey, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Porter J. Goss, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Gene Green, Mark Green, James C. Greenwood, Raúl M. Grijalva, Luis V. Guterrez, Gil Gutknecht, Ralph M. Hall, Jane Harman, Katherine Harris, Melissa A. Hart, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, J. D. Hayworth, Joel Hefley, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth, Baron P. Hill, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, David L. Hobson, Joseph M. Hoefel, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, John N. Hostettler, Amo Houghton, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Henry J. Hyde, Jay Inslee, Johnny Isakson, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Janklow, William J. Jefferson, William L. Jenkins, Christopher John, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Nancy L. Johnson, Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Sue W. Kelly, Mark R. Kennedy, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Gerald D. Kleczka, John Kline, Joe Knollenberg, Jim Kolbe, Ray LaHood, Nick Lampson, James R. Langevin, Tom Lantos, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, James A. Leach, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, William O. Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Ken Lucas, Stephen F. Lynch, Denise L. Majette, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Edward J.

Markey, Jim Marshall, Jim Matheson, Robert T. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Karen McCarty, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McCrery, James P. McGovern, John M. McHugh, Scott McInnis, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Michael R. McNulty, Martin T. Meehan, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Robert Menendez, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, Jeff Miller, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, George R. Nethercutt, Jr., Randy Neugebauer, Robert W. Ney, Anne M. Northup, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Devin Nunes, Jim Nussle, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Solomon P. Ortiz, Tom Osborne, Doug Ose, C. L. "Butch" Otter, Major R. Owens, Michael G. Oxley, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Charles W. "Chip" Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Richard W. Pombo, Earl Pomeroy, Jon C. Porter, Rob Portman, David E. Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, Jack Quinn, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, Rick Renzi, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers (AL), Mike Rogers (MI), Dana Rohrabacher, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Timothy J. Ryan, Jim Ryun, Martin Olav Sabo, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Bernard Sanders, Max Sandlin, Jim Saxton, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Edward L. Schrock, David Scott, Robert C. Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, John B. Shadegg, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Christopher Shays, Brad Sherman, Don Sherwood, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Rob Simmons, Michael K. Simpson, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar S. Smith, Nick Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis, Mark E. Souder, John M. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Charles W. Stenholm, Ted Strickland, Bart Stupak, John Sullivan, John E. Sweeney, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, W. J. (Billy) Tauzin, Charles H. Taylor, Gene Taylor, Lee Terry, William M. Thomas, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Patrick J. Toomey, Edolphus Towns, Jim Turner, Michael R. Turner, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, David Vitter, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Zach Wamp, Maxine Waters, Diane E. Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Curt Weldon, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Heather Wilson, Joe Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, Albert Russell Wynn, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8358. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of

Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 04-07), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

8359. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997; to the Committee on International Relations.

8360. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Development Fund for Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, as expanded in scope in Executive Order 13315 of August 28, 2003; to the Committee on International Relations.

8361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report providing information on steps taken by the U.S. Government to bring about an end to the Arab League boycott of Israel and to expand the process of normalization between Israel and the Arab League countries, as requested in Section 535 Division D of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Pub. L. 108-199); to the Committee on International Relations.

8362. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8363. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8364. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8365. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8366. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8367. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8368. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8369. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8370. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8371. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8372. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Procurement Program for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns [FAC 2001-23; FAR Case 2004-002] (RIN: 9000-AJ92) received May 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8373. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report entitled, "Outer Continental Shelf Lease Sales: Evaluation of Bidding Results" for Fiscal Year 2003, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(9); to the Committee on Resources.

8374. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Extension of Amended Special Regulations for the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse (RIN: 1018-AJ26) received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8375. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To Designate Critical Habitat for the Santa Ana Sucker (*Catostomus santaanae*) (RIN: 1018-AT57) received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8376. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for *Astragalus pycnostachyus* var. *lanisissimus* (Ventura Marsh milk-vetch) received May 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8377. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clarification of Substituted Federal Enforcement for Parts of Missouri's Permanent Regulatory Program and Findings on the Status of Missouri's Permanent Regulatory Program; Correction — received May 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8378. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Withdrawal of Regulations Governing Incidental Take Permit Revocation (RIN: 1018-AT64) received May 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8379. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Skates Management in the Groundfish Fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031218322-4137-02; I.D. 111903A] (RIN: 0648-AR73) received May 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8380. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast

Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications; Pacific Whiting [Docket No. 031216314-4118-03; I.D. 112803A] (RIN: 0648-AR54) received May 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8381. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan [Docket No. 040209049-4117-02; I.D. 012204B] (RIN: 0648-AR83) received May 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8382. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No. 031216314; 3314-01; I.D. 050704A] (RIN: 0648-AR54) received May 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8383. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting notification that during FY 2003, no claim was paid from the Victims Compensation Fund established by the Witness Security Reform Act of 1984, Pub. L. 98-473 because no claims were filed, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3525(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8384. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA), Model C-212 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-262-AD; Amendment 39-13561; AD 2004-07-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8385. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-13556; AD 2004-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8386. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-13483; AD 2004-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8387. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, C4-605R Variant F, and F4-600R (Collectively Called A300-600) Series Airplanes; and Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2004-NM-57-AD; Amendment 39-13590; AD 2004-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8388. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and -400D Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2004-NM-42-AD; Amendment 39-13593; AD 2004-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 19, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8389. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation to continue in effect a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam for a further 12-month period and a determination that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for Vietnam will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act and the reasons for such a determination, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 108-191); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8390. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a waiver of the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Turkmenistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 108-189); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8391. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a waiver of the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the Republic of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 108-190); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8392. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2005 budget request, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4114. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exclude non-native migratory bird species from the application of that Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2909. A bill to ensure the continued availability of the Utah Test and Training Range to support the readiness and training needs of the Armed Forces; with an amendment (Rept. 108-521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2619. A bill to provide for the expansion of Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge; with an amendment (Rept. 108-522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. S. 1146. An act to implement the recommendations of the Garrison Unit Tribal Advisory Committee by providing authorization for the construction of a rural health care facility on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, North Dakota (Rept. 108-523 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4175. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2004, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-524).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL PURSUANT TO RULE XII

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker.

H.R. 3266. Referral to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than June 14, 2004.

S. 1146. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than July 9, 2004.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 4496. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to strengthen and improve programs under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 4497. A bill to establish or expand pre-kindergarten early learning programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4498. A bill to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 4499. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure that certain prevailing parties receive attorneys' fees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 4500. A bill to provide for energy research and development; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and the Budget, 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. UPTON (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4501. A bill to extend the statutory license for secondary transmissions under section 119 of title 17, United States Code, and to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to such transmissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MCHUGH,

and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 4502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that distributions from an individual retirement plan, a section 401(k) plan, or a section 403(b) contract shall not be includible in gross income to the extent used to pay long-term care insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 4503. A bill to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Ways and Means, Resources, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Agriculture, and the Budget, 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. DELAY (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4504. A bill to improve protections for children and to hold States accountable for the orderly and timely placement of children across State lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 4505. A bill to improve the governance and regulation of mutual funds under the securities laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 4506. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for areas that experience a disaster that results in major damage to or destruction of 100 homes or fewer; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself and Mr. LAMPSON):

H.R. 4507. A bill to ensure the continuation and improvement of coastal restoration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 4508. A bill to amend the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 to require the Secretary to permit continued use and occupancy of certain privately owned cabins in the Mineral King Valley in the Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 4509. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out activities in support of the collaborative Very Energetic Radiation Imaging Telescope Array System (VERITAS) project on Kitt Peak near Tucson, Arizona; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4510. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress copies and descriptions of contracts and task orders in excess of \$1,000,000 for work to be performed in Iraq and Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 4511. A bill to provide for the cancellation of debts owed to the International Mon-

etary Fund by poor countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 4512. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for lower prices for Medicare prescription drugs and to eliminate the gap in coverage of Medicare prescription drug benefits, to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations for the reimportation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. FORD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG (for himself and Mr. SPRATT):

H. Con. Res. 441. Concurrent resolution recognizing the essential role of nuclear power in the national energy policy of the United States and supporting the increased use of nuclear power and the construction and development of new and improved nuclear power generating plants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H. Con. Res. 442. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of Amtrak's Empire Builder rail line; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H. Con. Res. 443. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should formally withdraw its membership from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 661. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 662. A resolution recognizing that Flag Day originated in Ozaukee County, Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 107: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 299: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. QUINN.

- H.R. 303: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 586: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 677: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 814: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 839: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 852: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 962: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 967: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 976: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1083: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1149: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1160: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1214: Mr. FROST and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1258: Mr. FATTAH and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1322: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1336: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1355: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 1523: Mr. CLAY and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1565: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1776: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1910: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2037: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 2157: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2181: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2217: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 2260: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2598: Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2674: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2683: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2711: Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2949: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2968: Mr. GORDON and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3180: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3184: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 3193: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 3246: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 3266: Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. TURNER of Texas.
H.R. 3292: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 3359: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3360: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3361: Mr. MOORE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3422: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3476: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 3480: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 3539: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 3574: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3602: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 3615: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 3619: Mr. JOHN.
H.R. 3634: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3684: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3804: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3809: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3831: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3834: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 3953: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 3965: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3968: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3988: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 4016: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4022: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. HART.
H.R. 4052: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 4094: Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 4097: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 4103: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 4107: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4116: Mrs. BONO and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4130: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 4131: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 4132: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 4133: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 4155: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4169: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4188: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4192: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4194: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4230: Mr. EVANS and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4264: Mr. CHOCOLA.
H.R. 4290: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4341: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4356: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4358: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BALLENGER, and Ms. HART.
H.R. 4363: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4370: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 4380: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 4391: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 4392: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4413: Mr. RENZI and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 4420: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 4435: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 4449: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 4463: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4471: Mr. NEY.
H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. STENHOLM.
H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. CHANDLER.
H. Con. Res. 396: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 418: Mr. EVANS and Mr. PITTS.
H. Con. Res. 427: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Res. 38: Mr. DICKS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 140: Mr. ANDREWS.
H. Res. 267: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H. Res. 596: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 621: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Res. 633: Mr. FROST.
H. Res. 646: Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. BALDWIN.

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. 857: Mr. PICKERING.