

sense that they knew the parameters of where we were going, and I think that is all the minority is asking for. I think that is a fair request. But in any event, I think we ought to move this bill, and the gentleman's side is in charge and we would hope that would happen.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, we can move this bill and move to conference as quickly as we want to. Unfortunately, in the other body, the minority wants certain concessions before they even go to conference. The reason for conference is everybody getting in a room between the two bodies and work out their differences, not make side deals or those kinds of deals outside the conference before they allow their body to go to conference. So when the minority decides to go to conference over in the Senate, we will go to conference and we will have a highway bill.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I want the leader to know how happy I am to hear that that is the purpose of conferences and that nobody would want to reach outside deals outside of the configuration of a conference. He will recall, I think, we had months of discussion about the prescription drug conference to which no Democrats on this side were invited. That is the concern. Mr. DASCHLE was not invited. Mr. REID was not invited. Other Members were not invited. There were a couple of people who participated. But that is our concern. We could go back and forth.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on that point I would just say this is a different issue. Both Democrats and Republicans want this highway bill, and in the case of the Medicare bill that the gentleman describes, the names that he listed, none of those names wanted the Medicare bill.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time just for a minute for accuracy's sake, all of them wanted a Medicare prescription bill. They wanted a different kind of bill. That is what he says conference is trying to iron out. That is my point. I think he makes it.

Mr. DELAY. They wanted a bill that was impossible to pass, and there was no use in wasting our time.

Mr. HOYER. As was yours almost, as I recall.

Mr. DELAY. Ours passed.

Mr. HOYER. The hope is that we will, in fact, move this piece of legislation and that there will be a bipartisan attempt made to move this legislation which is critical to our country, and a bipartisan agreement would be reached, as the leader points out, with the minority, giving them confidence that they will play a full role in the conference. I am hopeful that that happens.

I thank the gentleman for his observations.

□ 1700

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 17, 2004, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 18, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, May 17, 2004, for morning hour debate and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. Tuesday, May 18, for morning hour debate as though after May 31, 2004, thereafter to resume its session at 10 a.m.

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

There was no objection.

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, the order of the House of December 8, 2003, and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. KOLBE, Arizona, Chairman
 Mr. BALLENGER, North Carolina, Vice Chairman
 Mr. DREIER, California
 Mr. BARTON, Texas
 Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois
 Mr. WELLER, Illinois
 Mr. STENHOLM, Texas

ADVICE FOR WHITE HOUSE ON CREATING 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, last week, President Bush came to Ohio, my home State, to try to defend his economic policies, a State that has lost 222,000 jobs since he took office. One out of every six manufacturing jobs in the State has disappeared since he took office. We have lost almost 200 jobs every single day of the Bush administration.

Yet the President's answer, again and again and again, is more tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country, with the hopes that maybe it will trickle down and provide a few jobs,

which it has not, and more NAFTA-like trade agreements, which continue to hemorrhage jobs, continue to shift jobs overseas.

The White House, instead of those two failed attempts at creating jobs and building our economy, the White House should support extending unemployment benefits to those 50,000 Ohioans who have seen their benefits expire, should pass Crane-Rangel legislation, bipartisan legislation that will give incentives for American companies to manufacture in this country, instead of giving incentives, as the Bush administration does, to the largest companies in the country that continue to export jobs overseas.

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.

ORGANIZING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO HANDLE POST-CONFLICT AND STABILITY OPERATIONS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, even as jubilant Berliners chipped away at the Berlin Wall 15 years ago, many Americans saw the end of the Cold War as an opportunity for the United States to cut its military forces, reduce the number of American troops deployed overseas and divert the monies saved, the so-called peace dividend, to address priorities here at home.

In the wake of the heady days of November 1989, few American policymakers were concerned about the civil war that was raging in Afghanistan, which the Soviet Army had quit 9 months earlier. As the Soviet armor rumbled north across the Afghan border, we closed the book on our deep involvement in the landlocked South Asian state.

Humanitarian and demining aid still flowed to Kabul, but the United States effectively left the heavily armed warring factions to battle each other, setting the stage for the rise of the Taliban. Eleven years later, on September 11, we paid dearly for our reluctance to get involved in helping to bring peace to Afghanistan and to stabilize and disarm the warring factors in the aftermath of the Soviet departure from the country.

Much of this failure can be attributed to an aversion to the kind of post-conflict nation-building operation that might have created a different Afghanistan in the 1990s. These operations are expensive, they are dangerous, they require an extended commitment of our national resources and our attention, and they impose a heavy burden on the military.