

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this motion.

I am delighted that my good friend from Texas, and we are good friends, put on the record that there will be no change in the Republican bill on defined benefits. That means that our seniors know what they are talking about. They are against that bill, because they will not get a prescribed, guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit as it now stands.

So the reason why we have a motion to instruct is because we are fighting not to privatize Medicare and, in so doing, I say to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) has rightly suggested that the premiums that we will save, we can then invest in our DSH hospitals who are suffering and whose doors are closing.

I want a guaranteed prescription drug benefit, Medicare prescription drug benefit, and I am committed to working with the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and my friends on the other side of the aisle to get what seniors understand is realistic, something this Congress, Republicans and Democrats, have promised for over 10 years.

But as we are working now, it is important, since we are locked out of the conference, that we instruct them to recognize the importance of helping the suffering hospitals that I have in my district. Northwest Memorial Hospital, which I had a chance of visiting, has an enormous caseload of uninsured patients, if you will, or uninsured individuals in their service area. They have a desire to have a prenatal clinic that will serve a number of individuals, including our Hispanics and other minorities in the area. They cannot do it because they do not have the money.

Mr. Speaker, let us support this motion to instruct that provides the resources to help our hospitals from closing their doors.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time, and I will be brief in closing.

The fact of the matter is that the section I read, this law, this very thick law deals with existing Medicare today, where we offer reinsurance to seniors that there will be no change in those defined benefits. But the rest of that very thick bill talks about two things. The way that we can help seniors finally pay for the prescription costs that are so valuable to them, but so expensive, and, in a way that we are talking about tonight, we can offer seniors new choices in health care plans while we are making Medicare last longer and perform better.

This is the issue we have before us tonight: whether we are willing to just simply add prescription drugs to Medicare, a load that will be too large when

our baby boomers, our next generation come to rely upon Medicare; or do we add prescription drug coverage in a way that we also improve Medicare, where we make it last longer, where we make it a better system for our seniors, one that the next generation can count on; where we give the reforms and offer the choices that Members of Congress and our Federal workers have; where it is not Washington one-size-fits-all plans; where we do not dictate to people and mandate to people; where we do not ration the health care; where we do not tell them what is best for them; and where the bureaucracy does not get in-between the doctor and the patient.

Mr. Speaker, our seniors want help with prescription coverage, but they also want a Medicare system they can count on for years and years and years to come. These reforms, these improvements will lengthen Medicare, make it a better health care system, offer new choices for seniors who want them, and offer the types of choices the Members of Congress have. That is the debate tonight.

It all comes down to this: why is the health care system we have good enough for us in Congress, but not good enough for our seniors back home? My answer is that it is. They ought to have those same types of choices. They have earned it. They deserve it. And we are going to have a system that is not only better, but will last a long, long time.

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

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

I would first like to thank all of my colleagues who spoke on behalf of this motion today. I would like to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. BRADY) from across the aisle for participating in this debate. We may differ in our opinions about which way is the best way to reform Medicare, but I appreciate his willingness to engage, in any case.

I would like to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider supporting my motion to instruct. The premium support provisions in both the House and Senate versions of this bill are a recipe for disaster for our seniors. If premium support is enacted, our seniors will be subjected to vastly different premiums and benefits depending on where they live, they will be forced to assume all the risks associated with health care, and they will most likely lose their ability to choose their preferred doctor and hospital, that is, if the private plans even participate.

In my district, all but one of the supplemental private insurance plans we have once had have pulled out of our area, leaving my constituents in a serious lurch. Let us not take this giant risk again, Mr. Speaker. Let us instead spend our resources helping our safety net hospitals survive. DSH hospitals are the backbone of our communities, and the number of uninsured continue

to grow, as do their responsibilities to serve these populations. My motion retains the best provisions from both the House and Senate, and allocates any monies saved from dropping premium support to DSH hospitals across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROPOSED USE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDS RELATED TO TERRORIST THREATS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-140)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE) 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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with Division C, District of Columbia Appropriations Act of Public Law 108-7, the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003, I am notifying the Congress of the proposed use of \$10,623,873 provided in Division C under the heading "Federal Payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia." This will reimburse the District for the costs of public safety expenses related to security events and responses to terrorist threats.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 6, 2003.

CONFERENCE ON THE CHANGING NATURE OF THE HOUSE SPEAKERSHIP

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is among my duties to keep in mind the historical precedents of this body when

determining how legislation will move through the House. I am very privileged to do this job for our esteemed Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

Speaker HASTERT perhaps, more than any other in recent history, is uniquely qualified to bring a historical perspective to his job as Speaker as he was, as we all know, a government and history teacher at Yorkville High School in Illinois.

Because of his deep-rooted interest in the history of our Republic, it is my pleasure to announce to our colleagues that Speaker HASTERT, along with former Speakers Jim Wright, Tom Foley, and Newt Gingrich, will be participating in an event entitled, "The Changing Nature of the House Speakership: The Cannon Centenary Conference." This conference, named for Joseph Cannon, is being held on November 12 and is jointly sponsored by the Congressional Research Service and the University of Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of our colleagues to take the time to participate in this conference and perhaps learn something new about the history of this great body and the institution of the Speakership.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the program here, and I will include it in the RECORD at this point.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF THE HOUSE SPEAKERSHIP: THE CANNON CENTENARY CONFERENCE

A HISTORIC EVENT FEATURING ALL THREE LIVING FORMER SPEAKERS AND THE CURRENT SPEAKER

The Speaker of the House is second in line only to the Vice President to succeed to the presidency. Few lawmakers can be said to possess the visibility and authority of the Speaker.

The role of the Speaker has been shaped largely by history rather than by constitutional definition. The Speakership has been influenced by the individuals who have held the post and the circumstances in which they have operated; formal obligations that have been assigned to the office by House rules and by statute; the character of the House as a political and constitutional institution; and the traditions and customs that have evolved over time.

We invite you to attend a one-day conference examining the changing nature of the speakership—a historic event featuring the current Speaker and all three living former Speakers and commemorating the centenary of one of the most noteworthy Speakers in the history of the House: Joseph G. Cannon, Republican from Illinois, who served as Speaker from 1903 to 1911.

This conference will explore the evolving nature of the speakership and discuss the key forces and factors which influence the ability to lead a large and complex institutions like the House of Representatives.

8:30 am Registration

9:00 am Welcome and Introduction—Daniel P. Mulhollan, Director, Congressional Research Service

9:15 am The O'Neill Speakership, 1977-1987—John A. Farrell, author, "Tip O'Neill and the Democratic Century" Comments by Hon. Mickey Edwards and Hon. Dan Rostenkowski

10:45 am Hon. James C. Wright, Jr., Speaker, 1987-1989—Comments by Hon. David E. Bonior and Hon. Tom Loeffler

Noon-1:45 pm Hon. J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker

2:00 pm Hon. Thomas S. Foley, Speaker, 1989-1995—Comments by Hon. Vic Fazio and Hon. Bill Frenzel

3:30 pm Hon. Newt Gingrich, Speaker, 1995-1999—Comments by Hon. Leon E. Panetta and Hon. Robert S. Walker

4:45-5:15 pm Conference Summary—Robert V. Remini, author of books on Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay and Daniel Webster

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). 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.

REPUBLICANS SEND WRONG MESSAGE TO AMERICA'S VETERANS

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, with Veteran's Day nearing, I am ashamed, frankly, of how little this House of Representatives has done for the men and women who have served our country. There has been lots of talk, good talk, especially in the early days of November, but not much real action. In honor of our veterans, the men and women who are risking their lives today, tonight, and tomorrow in Iraq and Afghanistan, the many who have lost and continue to lose their good health and even their lives, our message should reflect our admiration for their commitment. It does not.

In July, House Republican leadership, through a procedural maneuver, struck down an attempt to restore \$1.8 billion, just to restore \$1.8 billion in veterans health care funding when they forced the House to vote on a bill with inadequate funding for veterans' health. Democrats and veterans' groups opposed the bill and demanded that the Republican leadership restore funding to the Veterans Administration. Now, it appears the VA-HUD appropriations bill will come out of conference \$500 million short of the VA funding level that we demanded and the Republicans promised in their budget resolution.

What kind of Veteran's Day message is that sending?

In light of the inadequacy of the majority's VA spending bill, Democrats fought for consideration of other solutions that would make up for those shortfalls that Republicans offered. Over 200 Democrats signed a discharge petition offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) that would force the House to consider legislation to eliminate the discriminatory disabled veterans tax. Responding, finally, to this pressure, Republican leaders offered a proposal that would only reach 50 percent of those veterans unfairly affected by this tax. Because this pro-

posal would be phased in over 10 years, reduction of the tax would be very small in the early years of the proposal and veterans would not even receive their full benefits. This is the best Republicans could offer: Veterans would not receive their full benefits until 2014, 11 years away.

This so-called solution pits one group of veterans against another group of veterans, hardly something we should do any time, but especially something we should not do in wartime. That is some message.

Democrats have offered a legislative package that does the right thing. Our proposal increases veterans' health care over the next 10 years by \$10 billion. It would end the disabled veterans' tax and pay veterans \$500 a month if their disability claim has been left pending for longer than 6 months. It would give \$1,000 bonuses for those soldiers returning home from Iraq and from Afghanistan. It would make military pay increases permanent for those in imminent danger and away from their families.

The Republicans have offered so much less; in fact, they have taken away. As soon as President Bush took office, he raised the copay at veterans' clinics across the country by 350 percent, from \$2 to \$7 per veteran per prescription drug per month. He has since proposed to raise that to \$15, from \$2 to \$7 to \$15; in effect, slashing the drug benefit that veterans have deservedly gotten in this country.

The President and Republicans have also cut education benefits.

□ 1945

Why are they cutting education benefits to veterans? Why are they cutting prescription drug benefits to veterans? The answer is simple. It is to make room for the Republican tax cut. The tax cut, everyone knows that by now, the tax cut, that if you are a millionaire you get \$93,000 tax savings. Half of the people in my district in Ohio, northeast Ohio, in Akron and Lorain, Northridge, half of them get zero. Half the people in my State get zero while the "leave no millionaire behind" tax cut from the President goes forward, making it not just unfair in terms of the taxes that the wealthy get benefits from in a tax cut, and the middle class and working families do not, but also that is why he has cut veterans benefits, that is why the President has cut education benefits.

This was all topped off, Mr. Speaker, by the actions early this fall where almost 200 Members of Congress on the Republican side voted for a \$3,500, in fact, pay increase for themselves and voted against a \$1,500 pay increase for our troops overseas. That is the height of hypocrisy. We do tax cuts for millionaires, we do pay increases for ourselves, then we turn around, my friends on the other side of the aisle, and do not vote for a pay increase for our young men and women in uniform.

Our young men and women were sent to Iraq on the promise that when they