

## SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

## WHAT SENIORS WILL REALLY PAY

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. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be voting before the end of the week on probably one of the most sweeping reforms in Medicare in the history of the program, and it is going to involve prescription drug coverage for seniors. There is a lot of misunderstanding about the bill, mainly because the bill has not been reported out of the committee yet; but we have gotten a synopsis of the bill, and I think it is important to see what this is really going to do.

Tonight, and I am going to be doing this every night, tonight I have a chart that shows what seniors will really pay on average. This is an average. If we look at the chart, the annual premium that seniors will pay every year is \$420, and then they have a \$275 deductible which totals \$695. Then they will pay 25 percent of the next \$1,925. The government will pay 75 percent, and that is a figure of \$481. If we add those together, that is \$1,176. And when we take out the amount that the senior is going to pay as opposed to what the government is going to be pay, for that \$1,176, the senior will be getting \$1,444.

After that there is what they call the doughnut hole: from \$2,200 to \$5,044 there is no coverage. So seniors will be required to pay on average about \$2,844. If we add the other costs I enumerated, we are looking at a total cost to seniors on an annual basis, if they get about \$5,000 in expenditures, they will pay \$4,020 and the government will pay \$1,444 of the total figure.

The fact of the matter is the senior will be out \$4,020, and the government's part will be \$1,444. I think it is very important that we make certain seniors understand this before we pass this bill because I think most seniors believe they are going to get first dollar coverage or get very broad coverage in a very short period of time, and this will

be a big disappointment to them, in my opinion.

The other thing I would like to point out is the cost of Medicare and Medicaid.

When I first got elected to the Indiana General Assembly, and I served in the Indiana State Senate, we were blackjacked by the Federal Government into taking Medicaid. At that time they told us it would cost about \$20 million per year for the Medicaid bill.

□ 2115

Medicaid in Indiana this past year was \$1.3 billion for our share and \$2.5 billion for the Federal Government share. If you just take the Indiana share, you will find that it is about 70 times what the initial cost was of Medicaid. So it went up 70 times since 1969. If you look at Medicare, Medicare was passed in 1965 and in 1967 Medicare cost, across the country, \$3 billion. In 2001, Medicare cost \$241 billion. I think it is very important that we put all this in perspective, because Medicare went up 80 times since 1965, Medicaid went up 70 times since 1969. And so we can anticipate that there will be a rapid growth in the prescription drug coverage as seniors find out what they are not getting and what they expected.

I would like to say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, seniors need to get the facts. The fact is they are not going to get the benefits that they think they are going to get, and if they do get the benefits that they think they are going to get, the cost is going to be much higher than the \$400 billion over 10 years they have talked about. As a matter of fact, I have been told, and I cannot verify this, that CBO has said it is going to cost \$432 billion over the next 10 years, and the bill has not yet been reported to my knowledge out of committee.

I think this is very, very important. AARP, the senior organization, has said this is a very beneficial thing for seniors, and it is a good first step. I think they realize that when seniors find out about this, they are going to demand more. I can understand that. So what will happen, I believe, is what happened in 1988 when we passed the catastrophic health care bill. Seniors thought they were getting a good deal. I voted against that bill. There were 11 of us that voted against it in 1988. We were castigated by senior groups and seniors across the country because they said we did not care about them. But a year and a half later, when seniors found out what was in the bill, they were chasing Dan Rostenkowski, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, down the street with umbrellas, beating on his car saying, what have you done to us and the bill was repealed within a short period of time.

I am going to make a prediction tonight. If we pass this bill in its present form, I believe that the seniors are

going to be very upset not only with the Congress, but with AARP and other groups that say this is a very good first step. Because when they find out that the benefits that they anticipate are not there, they are going to be very angry just like it was in 1988. I would like to say to my colleagues, let us do what absolutely must be done to help seniors. Seventy-six percent of the seniors have a plan where they get their prescription drugs already. Twenty-four percent do not. We ought to help the 24 percent who do not. Those are the ones that we need to be helping. If we did that, I think we would solve a large part of the problem.

I will be back tomorrow night.

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

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

## EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order time out of order.

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

There was no objection.

IN MEMORIAM: HOWARD PETERS  
RAWLINGS, 1937-2003

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and honor a teacher and mentor and a friend, a dedicated husband and father from my hometown of Baltimore who rose from modest beginnings to lift up the people of his community and the State of Maryland.

Howard Peters Rawlings spent his earliest years in Baltimore's Poe Homes public housing project. However, when he finally succumbed to cancer on November 14 of this year, he had become one of the most influential and well-respected leaders of the great State of Maryland. Pete Rawlings' life exemplified the character and integrity that all Americans should seek to achieve in their own lives. That, Mr. Speaker, is why I ask that we pause in the work of this great House to reflect upon the character of this truly great man.

Despite the daily hardships of their lives, Pete Rawlings' parents, Howard Toussant and Beatrice Peters Rawlings, instilled in him the core values for which I rise to honor him today. Pete was born during the Great Depression, an age when few Americans expected a lifetime of exemplary achievement from any young African American. The young Howard Rawlings was not deterred, however. As a matter of fact, he was determined to be excellent at everything he did, and he was

successful at that. His dedication to excellence led Pete to academic success at Baltimore's Douglass High School and carried him onward until he earned his bachelor's degree at Morgan State University, his master's degree in mathematics at the University of Wisconsin, and the experience that would make him a master teacher in more ways than one. Yet, Pete Rawlings never forgot from whence he had come. He was called to public service and rose to chair one of the most powerful committees in the Maryland legislature.

The source of much of Pete's influence can be traced to his chairmanship of the appropriations committee in Maryland's House of Delegates, the legislative body where I served together with him for nearly 14 years. Pete was determined to make his lifelong fight for better schools, health care and housing the center of legislative debate, and he did succeed. He was a driving force behind the debates about reorganizing Maryland's school system, Maryland's higher education system, expanding financial support for our public schools, extending health care and creating safe and affordable housing for tens of thousands of additional families. We who were privileged to know and work with Pete understood that his influence did not derive from his position of power alone.

As Dr. Steven Carter once observed, true leaders are defined by their integrity. Leaders of integrity have the capacity to discern right from wrong and they act upon what they know to be right even if that commitment places them in peril. Dr. Carter's insights about integrity are exemplified by Pete Rawlings' lifetime of service to the people of our community and State. In his commitment to the education of our children, health care for all and fair housing, Delegate Rawlings consistently followed his vision of what is right, both for the present and for decades to come. At times, he was rewarded for his dedication by harsh criticism. Yet Pete remained steadfast, knowing that the course that he followed was opening the doors of opportunity for many people to come. Otherwise, he knew they would be left on the outside looking in and left in a state of arrested development. He did not seek celebrity or acclaim, but generations to come will remember him as a true and faithful servant who kept the faith of the people he served.

Mr. Speaker, all too often those of us in public life worry too much about the next election. A true statesman, however, worries about the next generation and children yet unborn. Pete Rawlings was such a man.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I am moved to share with you that dying from cancer, my friend and colleague continued working from his hospital bed until his death. The people of Maryland have lost a great leader and I have lost a great friend and mentor. At this difficult moment for Pete's loving wife Nina and their wonderful family, I join

all the people of the great State of Maryland in offering our prayers and our gratitude for a life well lived. I thank God that he allowed Pete Rawlings' life to eclipse with my own.

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

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

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

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

#### RENEWABLE FUELS STANDARD

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed an energy bill, the first comprehensive energy bill that we have had in more than a decade. It is now being considered by the other body. I would like to talk about just one small part of the energy bill and that is the ethanol industry. Sometimes this is controversial. Many times people feel that this is simply a giveaway to the Midwest and particularly to farmers, but I would like to take another look at this.

It is true that the ethanol tax credit is 52 cents a gallon. In 2003, we produced 2.7 billion gallons of ethanol, so that amounts to a \$1.4 billion tax incentive. Of course, that is a cost to the taxpayer. But that is not the end of the story. The ethanol industry increases the demand for corn by roughly 10 to 15 percent and as most people understand, when the demand goes up, it also drives the price up. What happens is that we, because of the ethanol industry, increase the price of corn by a minimum of five to 10 cents per bushel, and in 2002 it is estimated that the price of corn increased by roughly 40 to 50 cents per bushel. As prices rise, farm price supports decrease. For instance, if a bushel of corn brings \$1.50 a bushel, the price support at \$1.50 is 82 cents in the farm bill. If the price goes to \$2.70, there is zero price support. As a result, what we have found is that the increase in price driven by ethanol decreases the cost of the farm bill by roughly \$1 billion. As a matter of fact, higher commodity prices in 2002 reduced farm bill spending by roughly \$3 billion along with the drought. In 2003, the farm bill is going to be reduced by roughly \$6 billion from projected cost. That is a 25 to 30 percent less costly farm bill than what we had anticipated.

In addition, and this is something that is really important, ethanol is

projected to lower gas prices by 6.6 cents per gallon based on 2002 prices. What that does, it translates into a \$3.3 billion annual savings to consumers. On the one side, we have a \$1.4 billion tax incentive which costs the taxpayers, but on the other side we have a \$1 billion tax saving in the farm bill and we also have a \$3.3 billion saving at the pump. So the net saving of the ethanol part of the farm bill and a part of the energy bill is roughly \$3 billion.

In addition, ethanol reduces dependence on foreign oil, equal to about what we received from Iraq before the war; reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 12 to 19 percent; reduces carbon dioxide by 35 percent; provides 192,000 new jobs in the United States; improves the U.S. trade balance by \$2 billion; increases net farm income by \$4.5 billion annually; and it can be produced from corn stalks, rice straw, waste products and switchgrass, so it is not confined to the Midwest States. As a matter of fact, we have some ethanol plants being developed now in California. It also increases the octane in fuel because of higher combustion rates.

Then I would like to mention also the fact that it can be used in diesel fuel to increase energy efficiency. It can be used to produce fuel cells. And also it produces high protein livestock feed as a by-product.

The last thing I would like to mention is something that is very much misunderstood. We often hear people say, it takes more energy to produce ethanol than it yields. Actually for every BTU of fossil fuel used to produce ethanol, that is, to plant the corn, to till it, cultivate it, harvest it and process it, for every 1 BTU, British Thermal Unit, you get \$1.389 BTUs of energy. In contrast, for gasoline for every BTU you get .808 BTUs, and for MTBE you get .675 BTUs of energy. You have a much higher yield.

You say, where does this come from? Basically, it comes from the fact that the corn absorbs the sun and this extra energy comes from the sun. It is very energy efficient, and we think it is going to be a tremendous benefit to the U.S. economy as we move forward and as we go from 2.7 billion gallons of ethanol to roughly 5 billion within the next few years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the war in Iraq. First of