



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 12, 2004

No. 95

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 12, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE ARM TWISTING

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was a bad day for democracy in the House of Representatives. Adding to their laundry list of legislative arm twisting, House Republicans once again bent democracy to fit their needs by holding a vote open for 38 minutes until they were able to change the outcome of the vote. Thursday was not an isolated incidence of arrogant disregard for the political process by Republican leadership in this Congress. It was an example of the modern-day Republican win-at-all-cost style of governance.

This shameful record speaks for itself. Never before, when the Democrats were in control, when Newt Gingrich was Speaker with the Republicans in control, never before until the last year or so has the House of Representatives operated in such secrecy.

At 2:54 a.m. on a Friday in March last year, the House cut veterans benefits by 3 votes.

At 2:39 a.m. on a Friday in April last year, the House slashed education and health care by 5 votes.

At 1:56 a.m. on a Friday in May, the House passed the leave no millionaire behind tax cut bill by a handful of votes.

At 2:33 a.m. on a Friday in June, the House passed the Medicare privatization and prescription drug bill by one vote.

At 12:57 a.m. on a Friday in July last year, the House eviscerated Head Start by one vote.

And then after returning from summer recess at 12:12 a.m. on a Friday in October, the House voted \$87 billion for Iraq. Always in the middle of night, always after the press had passed their deadlines, and always after the American people had turned off the news and gone to bed.

What did the public see? At best, Americans read a small story with a brief explanation of the bill and the vote count in Saturday's papers, understanding that Saturday is the least-read paper of the week; no accident there. But what did the public miss? They did not see the House votes which normally take 17, 18, 19, 20 minutes dragging on for as long as an hour as Members of the Republican leadership trolled for enough votes to cobble together a majority.

They did not see GOP leaders stalking the floor for whoever was not in line. They did not see the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader; and the majority

whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) coerce enough Republican Members into switching their votes in the middle of the night to produce their desired results. In other words, the American people did not see the subversion of democracy.

In November, they did it again. The most sweeping change to Medicare in its 38-year history was forced through the House at 5:55 a.m. on a Saturday morning. The debate started at midnight, the rollcall began at 3. Most of us voted within the typical 20 minutes. Normally the Speaker would have gavelled the vote closed, but not this time because the Republican leadership Medicare privatization bill was losing. By 4 a.m., the bill had been defeated 216 to 218. Then the assault began. The gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Committee on Ways and Means chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Mr. TAUZIN) all searched the floor, walked around the Chamber looking for House Republicans that had the integrity and the guts to vote against their leadership and to do the right thing.

I watched them surround the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) trying first a carrot and then a stick; but he, with integrity intact, remained defiant. They then aimed at a retiring Member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) whose son is running to succeed him. They promised support if he changed his vote to "yes." They promised retaliation if he did not change his vote to "yes." He stood his ground.

Many of the two dozen Republicans who voted against the bill simply went home because they did not want to deal with the pressure. I found one Republican Member in the Democratic Cloak

□ 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.

H5473

Room in order to avoid Republican arm twisting. By 4:30, the browbeating had moved into the Republican Cloak Room in the back of the Chamber, out of sight of C-SPAN cameras and the insomniac public. Republican leaders woke up President Bush, and a White House aide passed a cell phone from one recalcitrant Member to another in the Cloak Room. At 5:55 a.m., 2 hours and 55 minutes after the rollcall began, twice as long ever as any rollcall had taken in the history of the House of Representatives, two western Republicans, one from Arizona and one from Idaho, emerged from that Cloak Room, walked down the aisle, picked up one of these cards, a green card, scrawled their name and their district number on it, and sheepishly surrendered it to the Clerk of the House. The Speaker gaveled the vote closed 2 hours and 55 minutes after it began. Medicare privatization had passed.

To paraphrase Yogi Berra, I guess it is not over until the drug companies and the Republican leadership says it is over.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans can do a lot in the middle of the night under the cover of darkness. Last week, House Republican leadership demonstrated a new bravado, the same kind of thing they did last year, month after month, by holding this vote open in broad daylight.

What can the American people expect to see from the Republican leadership in the future?

CELEBRATING LIFE OF MICHAEL C. SAVAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have always been told that life is filled with uncertainty. Therefore, we should always endeavor to do as much as we can while we can because we never know when the time will come when we cannot do.

Such has been the life of Michael C. Savage who recently died in a boating accident. Mike was young, 51 years of age. He was openly gay, had a partner of 15 years, was a loving son to his mother, Ms. Maureen Savage, and brother to his siblings, Chuck and Cindy.

Mike was the chief executive officer of Access Community Health Network, probably the most successful group of community health centers in the country. Mike worked on AIDS and gay issues in Chicago, moved away to Boston to become executive director of the Fenway Community Health Center, and then returned to Chicago to run the Access Community Health Corporation.

When Mike took over Access in 1994, they had nine sites. At the time of his death, he had grown the network into 41 sites and increased its annual budget

from \$19 million a year to almost \$70 million, and they served over 160,000 patients a year. In addition to his full time professional job, Mike was an active member of Dignity Chicago, a community of lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual and straight Catholics. He was also active with United Power For Action, Stand Against Cancer, and was a board member of the National Association of Community Health Centers.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around the community health center movement for many years; as a matter of fact, since its inception, and I have never encountered a more talented, energetic, visionary and effective leader, planner, and manager. It is indeed unfortunate Mike passed on so soon. Fortunately, he did much good while he was here.

Therefore, I express condolences to his family, friends and colleagues, and trust that Access will continue as the best of its kind in the Nation. We simply pause to say thank you to Mike Savage.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Ever-faithful Lord God, to create a new order among Your people, the prophet Ezekiel established a new scheme of weights and measures for all aspects of daily life and business.

His prophetic action causes us to ask what criteria do we use to measure and judge ourselves, others, and the performance of institutions today. Only You, O Lord, hold the light to see honestly the highest aspirations and, at the same time, the deepest limitations of Your people.

Help America to live in the light of Your eternal wisdom. Guide the determinations of this Congress as they formulate laws based upon America's ideals and yet practical enough to address our limitations in facing the most important problems of today and tomorrow.

Free government leaders from all self-deception and the manipulation of others, that they may accomplish Your good purpose for this Nation and be measured themselves honestly by their constituents. In You alone is the bal-

ance of mercy and justice now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. PETRI. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETRI 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1303. An act to amend the E-Government Act of 2002 with respect to rulemaking authority of the Judicial Conference.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO PASS REFORM TO CURRENT MEDICAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

(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, \$230 billion. That is the cost last year of the medical justice system in this country. Of that figure, 20 percent went to compensate patients for actual pain and damages, 20 percent went to lawyers' fees, 20 percent went to insurance overhead, and 25 percent was paid out in noneconomic damages for things like pain and suffering.

Mr. Speaker, we can scarcely afford this continued type of expenditure in this country; and, indeed, this House

has passed, twice in the past 2 years, legislation seeking to reform this system. Unfortunately, that legislation has languished on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, it is more than just the monetary damages, though. It is the cost in terms of the human capital that we are losing today from doctors who are leaving practice early, hospitals that are having to close their doors. But even more important than that, Mr. Speaker, is the cost of human capital that will never be developed. I am talking about students in medical school, undergraduate school, and high school who will look at their medical career ahead of them and decide it is just not worth the effort.

Mr. Speaker, we must act in this Congress.

CONDOLENCES TO FAMILY AND FRIENDS OF ARMY LT. ROBERT COLVILL

(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, the sad news reached Hoosiers last week. Army Lieutenant Robert Colvill, Junior, of Anderson, Indiana, lost his life fighting to liberate Iraq and defend American ideals overseas. He and three other soldiers died as a result of wounds suffered during a terrorist car bombing and mortar attack.

Robert Colvill, Jr., was a hero who believed in this great Nation. In the ninth grade, he determined he would serve his country in the Marine Corps. And so, after graduating from Madison Heights High School in 1991, he joined the Marines. He retired after 8 years of service, having achieved the status of sergeant. But his passion for fighting for his country was too much to ignore; and Robert Colvill, Jr., enlisted in the United States Army after only 1 year as a civilian.

I think Mayor Kevin Smith of Anderson, Indiana, said it best when he said, "Soldiers like Lt. Colvill represent the best of the United States of America, men and women of ideals who are unafraid to fight for freedom for themselves, their country, and other peoples of the world."

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Robert Colvill, Jr., is a hero whose service and sacrifice brought freedom to 25 million Iraqis. His memory and the memory of that sacrifice will forever be emblazoned on the hearts of two grateful nations.

I offer my deepest condolences to his family and friends and the community at large as we deal with the loss of a hero.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules

on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT DINAH WASHINGTON BE RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE MOST TALENTED VOCALISTS IN AMERICAN POPULAR MUSIC HISTORY

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 144) expressing the sense of Congress that Dinah Washington should be recognized for her achievements as one of the most talented vocalists in American popular music history.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 144

Whereas Dinah Washington was born in August 1924;

Whereas Dinah Washington was a singer and performer whose early influence and focus was gospel music and spirituals, and who first toured the Nation to perform in 1940;

Whereas Dinah Washington was hired to sing with Lionel Hampton's big band in 1943, and through this exposure gained her first recording contract;

Whereas Dinah Washington was recording with jazz stars and leaders in the industry by 1948, and was a full-fledged pop music star by the late 1950s after recording the ballad, "What a Difference a Day Makes";

Whereas Dinah Washington recorded in jazz, blues, rhythm and blues, and pop, and was considered a preeminent figure and enormously gifted vocalist in each; and

Whereas Dinah Washington died on December 14, 1963, after dominating the charts in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by today's measures would have been considered a tremendous crossover superstar: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that Dinah Washington should be recognized for her versatility, remarkable musical talent, and for influence on female vocalists in jazz, blues, rhythm and blues, pop, and gospel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 144.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 144.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 144, which expresses the sense of Congress that Dinah Washington should be recognized for her achieve-

ments as one of the most talented vocalists in American popular music history.

Born in 1924, Dinah Washington was a singer and performer whose early influence and focus was gospel music and spirituals. She began touring the country in 1940, was hired to sing with Lionel Hampton's big band, and signed her first recording contract in 1943.

Dinah Washington was recording with jazz stars and leaders in the industry by 1948 and was a full-fledged pop music star by the late 1950s after recording the ballad "What a Difference a Day Makes."

Throughout her career, Dinah Washington recorded in jazz, blues, rhythm and blues, and pop and was considered a preeminent figure and an enormously gifted vocalist in each genre. After dominating the charts in the late 1940s and 1950s, Dinah Washington died on December 14, 1963. By today's measure, she would have been considered a tremendous crossover superstar.

House Concurrent Resolution 144 is simple and straightforward. It expresses the sense of Congress that Dinah Washington should be recognized for her versatility, remarkable music talent, and for influence on female vocalists in jazz, blues, rhythm and blues, pop, and gospel. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his introduction of this resolution, and I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 144, which recognizes the tremendous talent and accomplishments of Dinah Washington.

I have always been told that music is universal and everlasting. Therefore, Ms. Washington's impact on music can be felt and seen even among today's contemporary talents. While Dinah Washington was born in the 1920s, her true impact on music began in the late 1940s and 1950s.

Ms. Washington's early focus was on gospel music and spirituals, yet she did not believe in mixing the secular and spiritual. And once she entered the nonreligious music world professionally, she refused to include gospel in her repertoire. She became a full-fledged pop music star by the late 1950s, giving her the title of the Most Popular Black Female Recording Artist at that time.

She was noted as one of the most versatile and gifted vocalists in American popular music history. Ms. Washington's talent lent itself to making recordings in jazz, blues, rhythm and blues, and pop.

Despite her passing in December of 1963, her music continues to influence artists today. In 1993, her memory and influence on music became forever as we remember she was inducted into the

Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Her face became a symbol of soul as her voice does in her music, as she is portrayed in one of the black history commemorative stamps.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge Members to support this resolution. I remember some of the titles of songs, "What a Difference a Day Makes," "Just 24 Little Hours," "My Yesterday Was Blue But Today I'm a Part of You"; and forever in the annals of music history will Dinah Washington be a part of us. What a difference a day makes and what a difference she made.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 144.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

CONGRATULATING CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FULLERTON TITANS BASEBALL TEAM ON 2004 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 704) congratulating the California State University, Fullerton Titans baseball team for winning the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I College World Series.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 704

Whereas on June 27, 2004, the California State University, Fullerton Titans baseball team won the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I College World Series Championship, the fourth College World Series Championship for the Titans baseball team;

Whereas the Titans defeated the top ranked University of Texas Longhorns by scores of three to two and six to four in consecutive games of the best-of-three World Series Championship in Omaha, Nebraska;

Whereas the Titans completed a remarkable season capped by finishing first in the Big West Conference during the regular season, winning the Big West Conference tournament championship, and winning the NCAA Championship in the same year after starting the season with a record of 15 wins and 16 losses;

Whereas Titans Head Coach George Horton was named the 2004 Big West Conference Coach of the Year for the third time in his career;

Whereas Titans baseball team members Kurt Suzuki and Jason Windsor were honored as All-Americans for the 2004 season by Baseball America;

Whereas the Titans baseball team has displayed outstanding dedication, resilience,

and sportsmanship throughout the season in achieving the highest honor in collegiate baseball;

Whereas the students, alumni, and faculty of California State University, Fullerton, and other fans of California State University, Fullerton Titans baseball have shown tremendous commitment and support to the Titans baseball program; and

Whereas the Titans have brought pride to the California State University, Fullerton, community and to the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the California State University, Fullerton Titans baseball team for winning the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I College World Series Championship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 704.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the author of the resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 704, which is legislation that I introduced. And this legislation congratulates my alma mater, the Cal State Fullerton Titans baseball team, on winning the 2004 College World Series. I am pleased that my colleagues from Orange County have joined me in acknowledging this triumphant season for the Titans.

For those of us who grew up in Orange County, this is a momentous occasion. This is the fourth time in the school's history that the Titans have won the College World Series championship.

□ 1415

The Titans' victory was far from predicted. They were the underdog from the start. They started this season with a 15-16 won-loss record at midseason. Despite their early struggles, the Titans continued to display character and resiliency by working hard. This scrappy Cal State-Fullerton baseball team went on to beat the odds and did so in the most humble fashion possible, through good old-fashioned teamwork.

Cal State-Fullerton went on to win the Big West Conference over perennial conference powerhouse Long Beach State. This contentious conference is hard fought year after year, with the Titans always displaying consistency and determination, although favorable results are not always the outcome. However, this season, as in some seasons past, the Titans emerged vic-

torious alongside their passionate coach George Horton, who sees every opportunity as one in which positive results may rise.

The Titans continued their inspiring display of teamwork and will to win throughout the College World Series. They defeated the University of Miami Hurricanes and then the University of South Carolina Gamecocks in the semifinals. This run of the Titans culminated with their sweep of the best-of-three championship series by defeating the top-ranked University of Texas Longhorns 6-4 and 3-2 in come-from-behind victories.

The Cal State-Fullerton Titans finished with an overall record of 47 wins and 22 losses and a postseason record of 11 wins and 2 losses. This victory for Cal State-Fullerton head coach George Horton was bittersweet as he defeated his longtime mentor and friend Augie Garrido who led the Titans in the past for 21 seasons during which he won three national championships before leaving to coach the University of Texas Longhorns back in 1996.

The atmosphere at both the stadium in Omaha, Nebraska, and back home in Orange County was electrifying. Fans across Orange County displayed their Titan pride in waves by wearing Cal State-Fullerton colors identified by the distinguishable orange and blue.

The Titans were welcomed home by an enthusiastic crowd of supporters upon their arrival in Orange County where a parade took place in honor of these exceptional college athletes.

Throughout the season, the Titans were led by a gutsy group of players such as All-Americans Kurt Suzuki, who hit a single with two outs in the bottom of the seventh inning driving home the game-winning run in the final game of the series, and Jason Windsor, who pitched his second complete game of the College World Series, earning him Most Outstanding Player honors as they captured the NCAA Division I baseball championship.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Cal State-Fullerton Titans' players, coaches, staff and fans who were instrumental in bringing the College World Series championship back to Fullerton for a fourth time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin in consideration of this resolution, and so I rise in support of H. Res. 704, recognizing the NCAA men's baseball championship earned by the California State-Fullerton Titans. The Titans started 15-16, highly unusual, but they capped a memorable run to the 2004 national championship with a 3-2 win over Texas. Cal State-Fullerton's All-American catcher, Kurt Suzuki, hit an RBI single in the bottom of the seventh inning to put the Titans ahead to stay.

Despite the loss, Texas coach Augie Garrido, the Texas players and their fans should be proud of a well-played

season. By winning this championship, California State-Fullerton's coach George Horton and the rest of the Titans have a lifelong memory to treasure. Cal State's fans and the entire university community should be proud, as they are, of their team's accomplishments.

I want to urge Members to support this resolution.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 704.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESOLVING BOUNDARY CONFLICTS IN BARRY AND STONE COUNTIES, MISSOURI

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1167) to resolve boundary conflicts in Barry and Stone Counties in the State of Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY CONFLICTS, VICINITY OF MARK TWAIN NATIONAL FOREST, BARRY AND STONE COUNTIES, MISSOURI.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "boundary conflict" means the situation in which the private claim of ownership to certain lands, based on subsequent Federal land surveys, overlaps or conflicts with Federal ownership of the same lands.

(3) The term "Federal land surveys" means any land survey made by any agency or department of the Federal Government using Federal employees, or by Federal contract with State-licensed private land surveyors or corporations and businesses licensed to provide professional land surveying services in the State of Missouri for Table Rock Reservoir.

(4) The term "original land surveys" means the land surveys made by the United States General Land Office as part of the Public Land Survey System in the State of Missouri, and upon which Government land patents were issued conveying the land.

(5) The term "Public Land Survey System" means the rectangular system of original Government land surveys made by the United States General Land Office and its successor, the Bureau of Land Management, under Federal laws providing for the survey of the public lands upon which the original land patents were issued.

(6) The term "qualifying claimant" means a private owner of real property in Barry or Stone County, Missouri, who has a boundary

conflict as a result of good faith and innocent reliance on subsequent Federal land surveys, and as a result of such reliance, has occupied or improved Federal lands administered by the appropriate Secretary.

(7) The term "subsequent Federal land surveys" means any Federal land surveys made after the original land surveys that are inconsistent with the Public Land Survey System.

(b) RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY CONFLICTS.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cooperatively undertake actions to rectify boundary conflicts and landownership claims against Federal lands resulting from subsequent Federal land surveys and correctly reestablish the corners of the Public Land Survey System in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri, and shall attempt to do so in a manner which imposes the least cost and inconvenience to affected private landowners.

(c) NOTICE OF BOUNDARY CONFLICT.—

(1) SUBMISSION AND CONTENTS.—A qualifying claimant shall notify the appropriate Secretary in writing of a claim that a boundary conflict exists with Federal land administered by the appropriate Secretary. The notice shall be accompanied by the following information, which, except as provided in subsection (e)(2)(B), shall be provided without cost to the United States:

(A) A land survey plat and legal description of the affected Federal lands, which are based upon a land survey completed and certified by a Missouri State-licensed professional land surveyor and done in conformity with the Public Land Survey System and in compliance with the applicable State and Federal land surveying laws.

(B) Information relating to the claim of ownership of the Federal lands, including supporting documentation showing that the landowner relied on a subsequent Federal land survey due to actions by the Federal Government in making or approving surveys for the Table Rock Reservoir.

(2) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION.—To obtain relief under this section, a qualifying claimant shall submit the notice and information required by paragraph (1) within 15 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) RESOLUTION AUTHORITIES.—In addition to using existing authorities, the appropriate Secretary is authorized to take any of the following actions in order to resolve boundary conflicts with qualifying claimants involving lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary:

(1) Convey by quitclaim deed right, title, and interest in land of the United States subject to a boundary conflict consistent with the rights, title, and interest associated with the privately-owned land from which a qualifying claimant has based a claim.

(2) Confirm Federal title to, and retain in Federal management, any land subject to a boundary conflict, if the appropriate Secretary determines that there are Federal interests, including improvements, authorized uses, easements, hazardous materials, or historical and cultural resources, on the land that necessitates retention of the land or interests in land.

(3) Compensate the qualifying claimant for the value of the overlapping property for which title is confirmed and retained in Federal management pursuant to paragraph (2).

(e) CONSIDERATION AND COST.—

(1) CONVEYANCE WITHOUT CONSIDERATION.—The conveyance of land under subsection (d)(1) shall be made without consideration.

(2) COSTS.—The appropriate Secretary shall—

(A) pay administrative, personnel, and any other costs associated with the implementation of this section by his or her Department, including the costs of survey, mark-

ing, and monumenting property lines and corners; and

(B) reimburse the qualifying claimant for reasonable out-of-pocket survey costs necessary to establish a claim under this section.

(3) VALUATION.—Compensation paid to a qualifying claimant pursuant to subsection (d)(3) for land retained in Federal ownership pursuant to subsection (d)(2) shall be valued on the basis of the contributory value of the tract of land to the larger adjoining private parcel and not on the basis of the land being a separate tract. The appropriate Secretary shall not consider the value of any Federal improvements to the land. The appropriate Secretary shall be responsible for compensation provided as a result of subsequent Federal land surveys conducted or commissioned by the appropriate Secretary's Department.

(f) PREEXISTING CONDITIONS; RESERVATIONS; EXISTING RIGHTS AND USES.—

(1) PREEXISTING CONDITIONS.—The appropriate Secretary shall not compensate a qualifying claimant or any other person for any preexisting condition or reduction in value of any land subject to a boundary conflict because of any existing or outstanding permits, use authorizations, reservations, timber removal, or other land use or condition.

(2) EXISTING RESERVATIONS AND RIGHTS AND USES.—Any conveyance pursuant to subsection (d)(1) shall be subject to—

(A) reservations for existing public uses for roads, utilities, and facilities; and

(B) permits, rights-of-way, contracts and any other authorization to use the property.

(3) TREATMENT OF LAND SUBJECT TO SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATION OR PERMIT.—For any land subject to a special use authorization or permit for access or utilities, the appropriate Secretary may convert, at the request of the holder, such authorization to a permanent easement prior to any conveyance pursuant to subsection (d)(1).

(4) FUTURE RESERVATIONS.—The appropriate Secretary may reserve rights for future public uses in a conveyance made pursuant to subsection (d)(1) if the qualifying claimant is compensated for the reservation in cash or in land of equal value.

(5) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.—The requirements of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) shall not apply to conveyances or transfers of jurisdiction pursuant to subsection (d), but the United States shall continue to be liable for the cleanup costs of any hazardous substances on the lands so conveyed or transferred if the contamination by hazardous substances is caused by actions of the United States or its agents.

(g) RELATION TO OTHER CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section affects the Quiet Title Act (28 U.S.C. 2409a) or other applicable law, or affects the exchange and disposal authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the Small Tracts Act (16 U.S.C. 521c), or the exchange and disposal authorities of the Secretary of the Army.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The appropriate Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (d)(1) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to pass S. 1167, the Senate companion to H.R. 2304. This legislation provides a mechanism for the Forest Service and the Army Corps of Engineers to resolve boundary conflicts between the Mark Twain National Forest and adjacent private landowners. The dispute over boundaries stems from recent surveys conducted by contractors to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which have frequently been found to be severely flawed by the State.

The measure sets a process for dealing with the disputed boundaries. A landowner would notify the Secretary of Agriculture of a disputed boundary, prompting a new land survey. If the Secretary determines the boundary conflict is the result of a reliance on a previous land survey, the land in dispute can be returned to the private property owner.

It is important to note that the bill does not require the conveyance of any particular lands. Where a new survey shows that the lands in question were surveyed improperly, the Forest Service can either execute a quit claim to the land, assert Federal ownership if the Federal Government has improved the land, or compensate the landowner for the land.

This is a case where the Federal Government has not exercised adequate due diligence in maintaining their land surveys to the detriment of their neighbors. Rather than redrawing map boundaries from Washington, we are creating a process where these folks can address their claims closer to home. The Committee on Agriculture regards this as an equitable solution to a local problem created by the Federal Government. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1167, which seeks to correct a number of boundary conflicts that have occurred in the vicinity of the Mark Twain National Forest in Barry and Stone Counties, Missouri.

The boundary conflicts at issue resulted from discrepancies between recent land surveys conducted by the U.S. Forest Service and decades-old surveys conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers. As a result of the more recent Forest Service land surveys, private property lines adjoining Federal lands were moved and private property landowners discovered that, due to their reliance on the older Army Corps of Engineers land surveys, they had in-

advertently trespassed on Federal lands.

S. 1167 will remedy these boundary conflicts by authorizing and directing either the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Army to convey title to U.S. Forest Service land on which private landowners can demonstrate that they inadvertently trespassed due to their innocent reliance on a previous inaccurate Federal survey, or relied on a survey based on a previous inaccurate survey.

This legislation largely mirrors H.R. 2304 which passed the House on November 17. While most of the differences between S. 1167 and H.R. 2304 are technical, S. 1167 gives the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Army more flexibility in resolving the boundary conflicts by explicitly allowing the appropriate Secretary to use existing authorities to resolve the conflicts, in addition to the process outlined in the legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that these boundary conflicts can be resolved.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends both for supporting this bill and the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me to talk about it a few minutes.

This is a bill, as the gentleman from California said, that the House has passed at an earlier time. It does seem occasionally that even in a very small, local issue that it takes an act of Congress to resolve a problem that one would think that common sense would be able to resolve, but in this case that is not the case and it takes this bill, Senate bill 1167, to provide a speedy resolution to really a boundary dispute affecting private property owners in my district.

The historic boundary lines neighboring the Mark Twain National Forest and Table Rock Lake in Missouri's Barry County and Stone County were blurred when the U.S. Forest Service decided in the recent past to restore the mid-1800s Corners Program. The only problem with restoring this program is that nobody, including the Corps of Engineers, had paid any attention to it since the mid-1880s and land surveys conducted in the 1970s by and for the Corps of Engineers have found that major discrepancies would be the case if these old markers somehow became the rule of how property would be determined. Instead, property has been based on a 1950s survey when Table Rock Lake was built.

A fight with the Federal Government over a boundary line can really be an uphill battle, as we all know or could imagine. Don Ayers of Shell Knob in my district tells me that the Forest Service showed up on his property and moved his boundary by 30 feet. When

they did that they essentially repossessed his driveway, took part of his garage and an outbuilding on the land that he had every reason to believe he owned and clearly not only had paid taxes on but had made improvements, including those improvements that the Forest Service said now would belong to them once that boundary line was moved. Recognizable and verifiable boundary lines are essential to private property ownership.

This bill, sponsored by my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, sets a process for dealing with disputed boundaries in Barry and Stone Counties. As the gentleman from California said, we passed similar legislation in this body last November. This bill allows us to go ahead and get that job done.

The Federal Government already owns one-third of the Nation's land, and inaccuracies in Federal surveys should never force landowners to forfeit their property. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 1167.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1167.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1167, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTABLISHING NATIONAL COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER WEEK

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 646) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Community Health Center Week to raise awareness of health services provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 646

Whereas community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers are non-profit, community owned and operated health providers and are vital to the Nation's communities;

Whereas there are more than 1,000 such health centers serving 15,000,000 people in over 3,500 urban and rural communities in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

Whereas such health centers have provided cost-effective, high-quality health care to the Nation's poor and medically underserved (including the working poor, the uninsured, and many high-risk and vulnerable populations), acting as a vital safety net in the Nation's health delivery system, meeting escalating health needs, and reducing health disparities;

Whereas these health centers provide care to individuals in the United States who would otherwise lack access to health care, including 1 of every 8 uninsured individuals, 1 of every 9 Medicaid beneficiaries, 1 of every 7 people of color, and 1 of every 9 rural Americans;

Whereas these health centers and other innovative programs in primary and preventive care reach out to over 621,000 homeless persons and more than 709,000 migrant and seasonal farmworkers;

Whereas these health centers make health care responsive and cost effective by integrating the delivery of primary care with aggressive outreach, patient education, translation, and enabling support services;

Whereas these health centers increase the use of preventive health services such as immunizations, Pap smears, mammograms, and glaucoma screenings;

Whereas in communities served by these health centers infant mortality rates have been reduced between 10 and 40 percent;

Whereas these health centers are built by community initiative;

Whereas Federal grants provide seed money empowering communities to find partners and resources and to recruit doctors and needed health professionals;

Whereas Federal grants on average form 25 percent of such a health center's budget, with the remainder provided by State and local governments, Medicare, Medicaid, private contributions, private insurance, and patient fees;

Whereas these health centers are community oriented and patient focused;

Whereas these health centers tailor their services to fit the special needs and priorities of communities, working together with schools, businesses, churches, community organizations, foundations, and State and local governments;

Whereas these health centers contribute to the health and well-being of their communities by keeping children healthy and in school and helping adults remain productive and on the job;

Whereas these health centers engage citizen participation and provide jobs for over 70,000 community residents; and

Whereas the establishment of a "National Health Center Week" for the week beginning August 8, 2004, would raise awareness of the health services provided by health centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) there should be established a "National Health Center Week" to raise awareness of the health services provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers; and

(2) the President should issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States and interested organizations to observe such a week with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 646 supports national community health centers and their invaluable work in numerous American communities. The great Americans that work at these centers serve the unfortunate and, as the resolution states, their service acts as a vital safety net in the Nation's health delivery system. Their work is so very important to the welfare of many, many men, women and children who have a variety of health and wellness needs.

Community health centers and public housing provide food, shelter and care to the Nation's needy.

□ 1430

And I am so pleased to join the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Government Reform, in support of this legislation. I hope its adoption today raises important awareness of the compassionate contributions to society provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers. The concerned men and women who provide these centers' health services deserve our gratitude. I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for advancing House Resolution 646.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Michigan in consideration of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of this resolution to establish a National Community Health Center Week. As we continue to discuss health care and as we continue hopefully to move towards enactment of a national health plan which covers everyone without regard to their ability to pay and as we continue to discuss access, affordability, and strategic deployment of services, we can take pride in some of our accomplishments in health care; and one of the most important and effective accomplishments since the enactment of Medicare and Medicaid has been the development of community health centers.

Fortunately, community health centers are available throughout the Na-

tion to help those in need or those who get displaced by job status or other economic conditions. Community health centers have become the safety net within the health care system, caring for one of every eight uninsured individuals, one of every nine Medicaid beneficiaries, one of every seven people of color, and one of every nine rural Americans, as well as reaching out to over 621,000 homeless persons and more than 709,000 migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Community health centers are established in almost every corner of our Nation representing every aspect of any congressional district, whether it be assisting the working poor in the inner city or in the rural farmland, migrant workers, or even those who have insurance but do not have access to any other health facilities.

These health centers provide high-quality, cost-effective health care as they continue to meet escalating health needs and assist in reducing health disparities as they provide high levels of quality care. With the weakened economy and unemployment reaching its highest point in almost a decade, our Nation's health centers are feeling and will continue to feel the brunt of increasing volume of patients, especially the uninsured. So by establishing a week to raise awareness of community health centers, we will also be highlighting each year the great accomplishments these nonprofit community-owned and -operated health providers offer to many communities throughout the Nation.

With recent numbers indicating that the Nation's uninsured population is even higher than once thought, at a startling 60 million, if our Nation will not realize the need for universal health care, we need to at least realize the importance and the need to better fund our community health centers.

So I am pleased to note the significant increase in the fiscal year 2005 budget that our community health centers that are in great need are receiving in order to continue and expand these services as well as construction for new and expanded facilities.

One of the most amazing and important aspects of community health centers is the involvement of the community. Each center tailors their services to best meet the needs and priorities of the communities in which they reside. Citizens in these communities become active participants in their community's health care decision-making. Health centers even provide approximately 70,000 jobs to the residents in communities of these areas.

Mr. Speaker, community health centers are indeed the safety net which is committed to serving all individuals with the mission that everyone deserves quality health care services regardless of where they reside, if they can pay or whether or not they have insurance. They are vital to ensuring that even the poor and disadvantaged in this country have the greatest opportunity to be healthy. These centers

are indeed a hallmark of development of our Nation's health care delivery system.

I am pleased that I can stand and be a part of promoting the awareness that they exist and the accomplishments which they have achieved.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for House Resolution 646, legislation expressing the sense of the House that a week in August should be set aside to promote public awareness of the many health services provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers.

Every day our Nation's health centers provide high quality, affordable primary care and preventive health services to people who might not otherwise have access to health care. Through their cost-effective, community-based approach, health centers serve a very important role in our efforts to ensure that all Americans have access to health care.

I am very pleased with the work of Utah's community-based health centers. In 2002, Utah's Health Centers provided comprehensive health care services for over 93,000 Utahns, and they are working to expand their services to meet the needs of Utah's working poor, homeless, elderly, minority, and rural populations. I have long supported the community health center program and am proud of the efforts of Utah's Community Health Centers to increase access to health care and preventive health services in a community-oriented fashion.

I believe it is very fitting that we recognize the commitment of our Nation's health centers with National Community Health Center Week and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge all Members to support House Resolution 646. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 646.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING DAVID S. TIDMARSH, 2004 SCRIPPS NATIONAL SPELLING BEE CHAMPION

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 684) honoring David Scott Tidmarsh, the 2004 Scripps National Spelling Bee Champion.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 684

Whereas Mr. David Scott Tidmarsh was a student at Edison Intermediate Center located in South Bend, Indiana;

Whereas Mr. Tidmarsh earned his right to compete for the national spelling bee title by

winning the City of South Bend, Indiana spelling bee;

Whereas the 77th Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee was held in Washington, D.C. June 1 through 3, 2004;

Whereas 265 spellers from across the United States, American Samoa, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Saudi Arabia, and the United States Virgin Islands all competed for the title;

Whereas Mr. Tidmarsh, competitor number 76, competed in the bee and survived 15 rounds of competition; and

Whereas Mr. Tidmarsh's achievement brings an immense sense of pride to Edison Intermediate Center, his hometown of South Bend, and the state of Indiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates David Scott Tidmarsh on his mastery of the English language, culminating in his correctly spelling "autochthonous" in Round 15, and becoming the 77th Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee champion;

(2) recognizes the dedication and achievement of Mr. Tidmarsh;

(3) wishes Mr. Tidmarsh much success in achieving his life goals; and

(4) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to Edison Intermediate Center, located in South Bend, Indiana, for appropriate display and to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to David Scott Tidmarsh and his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House acknowledges the accomplishments and the contributions of many deserving Americans during the course of every year. But today during the consideration of House Resolution 684, we congratulate one of our youngest honorees, and certainly one of the most impressive as well. Thanks to the work of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA), today the House of Representatives salutes the winner of the 77th Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee. This is a 14-year-old boy named David Scott Tidmarsh. He lives in South Bend, Indiana.

David won the South Bend city spelling bee to earn a trip to the Scripps National contest here in Washington, D.C. from June 1 through June 3. And during the championship, David survived 15 nail-biting rounds against a couple of hundred of the most gifted

spellers from across the Nation; and he clinched the championship on the word, and I hope I can even pronounce the word, "autochthonous." I believe it is pronounced. It was very impressive, I would say. For those who are scoring at home, let me spell it for them. That is a-u-t-o-c-h-t-h-o-n-o-u-s.

While it is not surprising, due to his very clear mastery of the English language, it is important to note that David is a straight-A student who loves to read. Reportedly David's favorite books are mysteries and science fiction. And I also understand he enjoys learning about politics; so I would certainly urge both the national political parties to think about recruiting this young fellow very early on. David obviously has a very bright future ahead of him no matter what he decides to do.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the whole House, we wish David Scott Tidmarsh the very best in his continued schooling and in the future. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) for recognizing David's incredible accomplishment, of which David should be very proud.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman from Michigan in consideration of this resolution honoring David Scott Tidmarsh, the 2004 Scripps National Spelling Bee Champion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a very special student for possessing a great skill. This year David Scott Tidmarsh survived 15 challenging rounds to win the 77th Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee by spelling a very challenging word. As a matter of fact, I was saying to myself that had not it been for the fact that Mrs. Beadie King taught us to read phonetically, that is, to break words apart and separate them, I probably never would be able to enunciate this word. But it is "autochthonous," and I thank Mrs. Beadie for the phonetic way in which she taught us to read. That helps me.

But the National Spelling Bee is a wonderful competition that celebrates a child's intellect and thirst for learning. Each year, students compete within their schools, then within their region, and then, if successful, at the national competition in Washington, D.C.

David Scott Tidmarsh advanced to the national competition by winning the Edison Intermediate Center competition in South Bend, Indiana, and then by winning the citywide competition.

At the National Spelling Bee, Tidmarsh was pitted against 265 other talented spellers from all over the U.S., as well as American Samoa, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Saudi Arabia, and the United States Virgin Islands. Using concentration and determination, Mr. Tidmarsh persevered to become national champion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate David Scott Tidmarsh. His

willingness to study hard and to work toward a difficult goal is an example from which all Americans can learn. He is indeed a rare and talented young person. Again, I extend to him my congratulations.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 684, a resolution honoring David Scott Tidmarsh, the 2004 Scripps National Spelling Bee champion. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for moving this resolution so quickly through his committee.

Mr. Speaker, 14-year-old David Tidmarsh is truly a remarkable young man. Having had the opportunity to meet him and witness his accomplishments, I think I can say that with great confidence.

This soon-to-be freshman at Adams High School in South Bend, Indiana, is no stranger to the national spelling bee contest. He finished tied for 16th place in last year's spelling bee, but this year he knew he could do better, and he set out on a plan to achieve that goal.

David Tidmarsh has four dictionaries that he calls his own in his personal collection, including one that is so well worn that, if you shook it, it would probably fall apart. He has read through that one cover to cover twice. In fact, he compiled a list of words he thought might be included in the contest and typed them into his family's home computer. He also studied word lists from prior competitions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say this is a very determined young man.

I was surprised to learn that in the 77-year history of the Scripps National Spelling Bee there has never been a winner from Indiana until this young man correctly spelled "autochthonous," which is hard enough to say, very hard to spell, in the 15th round.

Mr. Speaker, I know that people from all over the country were holding their breath, watching David spell that final word on ESPN. I also know that his school and his hometown of South Bend, Indiana, was overwhelmed with excitement when he claimed the championship.

In fact, he has had quite a whirlwind tour since winning. He won the trophy on Thursday, June 3. That very night, he and his family traveled to New York City, and the next morning he appeared on the CBS Early Show, ABC's Good Morning America, NBC's Today Show, and, after that, he appeared on Fox News and CNN as well.

After that, he came back here to Washington, D.C., to deliver the speech at the bee's banquet that evening; and then he finally went back home to South Bend, Indiana, on Saturday.

On Monday, he attended a rally in his honor at his school, Edison Inter-

mediate Center, hosted by the City of South Bend and the South Bend Community School Corporation. At the celebration, he was praised by Indiana's Governor, Joe Kernan, for the way he handled his victory. In fact, Governor Kernan was so impressed that he awarded David the State of Indiana's highest honor, the Sagamore of the Wabash Award.

But that was only the beginning of the accolades. South Bend Mayor Steve Luecke presented David with the key to the city and declared June 7, 2004, David Scott Tidmarsh Day. In St. Joseph County, Commissioner Cindy Bodle presented David with a key to the county.

Since that time in early June, David has thrown out his first pitch at a South Bend Silverhawks game, and I might say it was a strike, I was there to witness it, and he has appeared in numerous local parades and even had the opportunity to visit with the President of the United States in the Oval Office.

Everyone, including his very proud parents, his classmates, his extended Hoosier family, the Indiana Congressional Delegation and myself, are all extremely proud of David's accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 684, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 684.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD ON HIS 91ST BIRTHDAY

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 702) honoring former President Gerald R. Ford on the occasion of his 91st birthday and extending the best wishes of the House of Representatives to former President Ford and his family.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 702

Whereas Gerald Rudolph Ford was born on July 14, 1913;

Whereas Gerald R. Ford is the only person from the State of Michigan to have served as President of the United States;

Whereas Gerald R. Ford graduated from the University of Michigan where he was a star center on the football team and later turned down offers to play in the National Football League;

Whereas Gerald R. Ford attended Yale University Law School and graduated in the top 25 percent of his class while also working as a football coach;

Whereas in 1942, Gerald R. Ford joined the United States Navy Reserves and served valiantly on the U.S.S. Monterey in the Philippines during World War II, surviving a heavy storm during which he came within inches of being swept overboard;

Whereas the U.S.S. Monterey earned 10 battle stars, awarded for participation in battle, while Gerald R. Ford served on the ship;

Whereas Gerald R. Ford was released to inactive duty in 1946 with the rank of Lieutenant Commander;

Whereas in 1948, Gerald R. Ford was elected to the House of Representatives where he served with integrity for 25 years;

Whereas in 1963, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Gerald R. Ford to the Warren Commission investigating the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

Whereas from 1965 to 1973, Gerald R. Ford served as minority leader of the House of Representatives;

Whereas from 1974 to 1976, Gerald R. Ford served as the 38th President of the United States, taking office at a dark hour in the history of the United States and restoring the faith of the people of the United States in the Presidency through his wisdom, courage, and integrity;

Whereas in 1975, the United States signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, commonly known as the "Helsinki Agreement", which ratified post-World War II European borders and supported human rights;

Whereas since leaving the Presidency, Gerald R. Ford has been an international ambassador of American goodwill, a noted scholar and lecturer, and a strong supporter of the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan, which was named for the former President in 1999;

Whereas Gerald R. Ford was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1999; and

Whereas on July 14, 2004, Gerald R. Ford will celebrate his 91st birthday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors former President Gerald R. Ford on the occasion of his 91st birthday and extends its congratulations and best wishes to former President Ford and his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is certainly a true pleasure today to rise in support of House Resolution 702. This is a resolution that wishes former President Gerald R. Ford a wonderfully happy 91st birthday on behalf

of the House of Representatives. President Ford certainly holds a unique place in American history. Within a 1-year period during the very destructive Watergate scandal, he held the positions of House minority leader, of Vice President, and President because he was such a respected national leader of unquestioned integrity and principle.

Mr. Speaker, Gerald Rudolph Ford was born in Omaha, Nebraska, on July 14, 1913; and then he moved to Grand Rapids in the great State of Michigan shortly after his birth. He was always an exceptional student and athlete and was very active in extracurricular activities, even attaining the rank of Eagle Scout.

President Ford attended the University of Michigan to study economics and political science; and as a member of the U of M's football team, he won two national championships in 1932 and 1933. In 1934, he was named the team's most valuable player.

Rejecting offers to play professional football with either the Detroit Lions or the Green Bay Packers, Gerald Ford took a job at Yale University as a boxing coach and an assistant football coach, and he received his law degree then at Yale in 1941.

The war was on, and he joined the U.S. Naval Reserve during the war; and then he returned to Grand Rapids after the war, in 1946, to work as a lawyer. In 1948, he defeated the incumbent United States Representative in that district in the primary election and then won the general election by a very wide margin.

Mr. Speaker, Gerald Ford was a Member of this body from 1949 to 1973 and he served as House minority leader from 1965 to 1973.

□ 1445

In the Congress, Ford was an ardent proponent of strong national defense, and he realized the important role that the United States played in the global theater.

In October of 1973, as the Watergate scandal gradually unfolded, President Richard Nixon nominated Ford to succeed Spiro Agnew as Vice President of the United States. Ford became Vice President on December 6, 1973, and, in doing so, he also became the first Vice President to be appointed under the procedures of the 25th amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Gerald Ford's vice presidential tenure lasted less than a year. When Nixon resigned due to continued revelations of Watergate, Ford became President on August 9, 1974. In a move he deemed the best for the sake of the Nation, he issued a complete pardon to Nixon in an effort to end what he categorized as the Nation's long nightmare.

During his inauguration speech, President Carter paid immediate tribute to President Ford's role in helping America through such a difficult period saying, "For myself and for our Nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land."

On April 20, 1995, President Ford's boyhood home in Grand Rapids was designated as an historic site. I bring that up, Mr. Speaker, because at the time I was the Michigan Secretary of State, and one of my duties and responsibilities was serving as Michigan's official historian.

Certainly one of my fondest memories was hosting the President and his wonderful wife, his very gracious wife, Betty Ford, for the home's dedication. There was a huge crowd of family and friends and neighbors, and the President was standing on the front porch of his home telling everybody about some of his fond remembrances of living in that home in Grand Rapids and how he used to play baseball out in front of the house.

Gerald Ford is an extraordinary man and yet he grew up in an ordinary neighborhood, just like thousands of other neighborhoods all across our Nation. President Ford and his great accomplishments epitomize the greatness the American spirit, and I was truly honored to stand next to a living piece of American history that day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Michigan, the dean of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for introducing this highly deserved tribute to our 38th President of the United States, Gerald Ford. Our entire Nation thanks him for his service, and we wish him a very happy 91st birthday.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman from Michigan in consideration of this resolution, and it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the author of this resolution and one of the most distinguished and longest-serving Members of this body, the dean of the institution and the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague for yielding me time. I commend him for handling this legislation, as I do the gentlewoman from Michigan, who has done such a fine job of presenting the case for this legislation.

Today, we honor and congratulate a former President of the United States on his 91st birthday, and we extend to him and to his wife the best wishes of this body on this 91st birthday which he is celebrating Wednesday.

We are proud of his service, not only in this body, but elsewhere. He will be 91, as I mentioned, on July 14, which is Wednesday. He is married to a distinguished lady, Elizabeth "Betty" Ford, who is much loved in this body and much loved elsewhere.

He attended the University of Michigan, Yale University Law School, served with distinction in the United States Navy in the Philippines during

World War II. He served in the House of Representatives for 25 years and was appointed to and served with distinction on the Warren Commission by President Johnson.

He was minority leader of this body from 1965 to 1973 and Vice President from 1973 through 1974. He was sworn in as President on August 9, 1974, and served in this great capacity for 2 years.

The thing which I think we can best remember about Gerry Ford is not all of the distinguished actions which he took or the high offices which he held but, rather, the fact that in a very difficult time he brought this country together out of a period of ill will and misfortune, which I think is almost unique in the history of this country. With that healing leadership, he will be long remembered for what he has done for us. The University of Michigan School of Public Policy is named after him, and he is much loved also in our State.

I want to commend and thank my colleagues who have joined in the cosponsorship of this legislation: the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Bono), who is at this time his Congresswoman; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA); the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN); the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS); and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

We from the Michigan delegation have unanimously suggested that this is a good resolution for this body to adopt. We celebrate the accomplishments, the great humanity and decency of a wonderful citizen of our State and of the United States who served with distinction in the Presidency and in many other offices, and we do at this time wish him, through this resolution and in other ways, the best wishes of this body, of the House of Representatives and of all of us individually, and those many other American citizens who have had fine reason to love a great American who still serves his country with distinction.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 772, that extends 91st birthday wishes to President Gerald Ford.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today to pay tribute to former President Gerald Ford on the occasion of his 91st birthday and to thank him for his service to our Nation. President Ford assumed the office of President under difficult circumstances and guided us with strength and steadiness that helped us to regain confidence that we had lost in our Nation's most important office.

Looking back on President Ford's life, it is easy to see that he would distinguish himself as a leader. At the University of Michigan, he excelled both at his studies and at football. He received a law degree from Yale University. When duty called, he enlisted in the Navy, where he earned the rank of lieutenant commander during World War II.

Following the war, President Ford returned to his home State of Michigan and was elected to the House of Representatives for his first of 13 terms. An innate ability to lead helped President Ford rise quickly through the ranks of Congress. He was soon assigned to the influential Committee on Appropriations and rose to become the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

In 1972, Gerald Ford was nominated as Vice President. He became President in 1974, following the resignation of President Richard Nixon. Faced with many challenges when he took office, President Ford worked to repair the damaged relationship between the American people and its government and the image of America with the rest of the world.

Two of his historic accomplishments were bringing an end to the Vietnam War and facilitating improved relations between Egypt and Israel. Improved relations between Israel and Egypt would lead to a peace pact between the two rival nations, an unprecedented step towards peace in the region.

On his inauguration day President Jimmy Carter began his speech by saying, "For myself and for our Nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land."

While we all may not agree with all of the decisions President Ford made during his political career, we can all concur that he carried himself with dignity at a time when our Nation needed it most.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank President Ford for his service. I commend the gentleman from Michigan for introducing this resolution.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who holds a distinguished record of life-long public service to the United States. President Gerald R. Ford, the 38th President of the United States, celebrates his 91st birthday today. Since 1913, President Ford has been a diligent, humble steward of public service to our great country. He is a role model for all of us involved with public office, and I am fortunate to also call him a dear friend and constituent. It is with great pleasure that I con-

gratulate President Ford, and extend best wishes to his family on this day of celebration.

President Ford's public service began in high school, where he achieved the honor of Eagle Scout. He later earned ten battle stars as lieutenant commander in the Navy, served the State of Michigan in Congress for 12 terms, eventually served as House Minority Leader in 1965, and finally, he served our country as the 38th President. As President, he led America through the weakest economy of the post-World War II period, confronting tough issues as rising levels of both inflation and unemployment.

After completing his term as President, he returned to Rancho Mirage—a region of southern California that I have the privilege of representing. Now, even at the age of 91, he continues to invest time, energy, and experience into improving our community. His investments in the Rancho Mirage region helped to spark unprecedented levels of economic growth that began in 1983 and continue today. His commitments include support for the McCallum Theatre in Palm Desert, the Living Desert and Desert Museum, and the Eisenhower Medical Center and the Betty Ford Center.

In 1997, Ford joined Gen. Colin Powell in Philadelphia for the formation of America's Promise. In my district, he brought the goals of helping young people to fruition by chairing an America's Promise chapter in the Coachella Valley.

President Bill Clinton presented Ford with the Medal of Freedom in 1999, recognizing his role in guiding the nation through the turbulent times of Watergate, the Nixon resignation and the end of the Vietnam war. Also in 1999, he received the Congressional Medal of Honor for, "dedicated public service and outstanding humanitarian contributions."

In my district, President Ford is heralded as a man who consistently puts country over political party. He is a respected and honored leader, who tirelessly and passionately fights for principles of freedom, hope, and justice. On a personal note, President Ford has provided me with advice and inspiration to better serve the people of the 45th District of California.

Ford and his wife, Betty, continue to support numerous local and national charities and service projects. Despite Ford's long list of honors, his humble spirit remains as a shining example to us all. When asked about his and Betty's unrelenting investment of public service, he simply responded: "We're trying to do our full share." After decades of compassionate leadership, President Ford remains a trusted, proven leader, who views giving back to the community as a civic responsibility of all Americans, not just the task of elected officials.

On behalf of my constituents, the people of California, and the people of America, I am pleased to honor a man who has dedicated a lifetime to public service on this very special day. Happy 91st Birthday, President Gerald Ford. You are a continuous inspiration, admired leader, and valued friend.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, happy birthday to a great American, President Gerald R. Ford.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion

offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 702.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS PAUL RAY SMITH POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4380) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4737 Mile Stretch Drive in Holiday, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4380

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT FIRST CLASS PAUL RAY SMITH POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4737 Mile Stretch Drive in Holiday, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

□ 1500

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. 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 bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4380 commemorates the incredible bravery and patriotism of Army Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith. On April 4 of 2003, Sergeant Smith of Holiday, Florida, was tragically killed in action in Operation Iraqi Freedom during a fierce fire fight near Baghdad.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Smith was a member of the Bravo Company, Eleventh Engineer Battalion of the Army's

Third Infantry Division. He enlisted after graduating from high school and served an accomplished 13-year career in the Army. Sergeant Smith served valiantly in Operation Desert Storm, Operation Desert Shield, Kosovo, and Bosnia. He earned several military honors, including the Bronze Star as well as the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Smith leaves behind a wife and two children in Holiday, Florida; and we pray and we hope that this post office designation will always remind them of the bravery and the love of their husband and father, Paul Ray Smith. Our entire Nation owes Sergeant Smith an incredible debt, and that is why I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 4380. I certainly thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for advancing this legislation that honors the courageous Sergeant Paul Ray Smith.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4380, legislation designating the United States Postal Facility in Holiday, Florida, after Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) on May 18, 2004, was unanimously reported by our committee on July 8, 2004. The bill enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Florida delegation.

When Paul Smith graduated in 1989 from Tampa Bay Vocational-Technical High School, he did what a lot of young men and women do: he joined the Army. Sergeant First Class Paul Smith served in the Army's Eleventh Engineer Battalion, Bravo Company from Fort Stewart's Third Infantry Division, Mechanized. His unit was assigned to build a compound for Iraqi prisoners of war near the captured Baghdad Airport. As a combat engineer, Smith was part of a group that built bridges for troops to cross to difficult areas and found and destroyed enemy weapons.

According to news accounts, it was during the early morning of April 4, 2003, when Sergeant First Class Smith and his combat engineers were working on setting up roadblocks on the highway between the old Saddam International Airport and Baghdad. His battalion was attacked after knocking down the gate to a Republican Guard complex. At that point, a small group of American soldiers was confronted with over 100 Iraqi fighters.

Sergeant First Class Smith, after looking after his wounded troops, jumped into a damaged tank and fired upon the Iraqis with 50 caliber bullets for an hour and a half. His unit credits him with killing 30 to 50 of the enemy. When the fighting was over, Sergeant First Class Paul Smith was found shot in the head, the only soldier of his unit to die that day.

For killing the enemy and defending his unit against attack, Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith has received the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. He has been nominated for the highest military honor: the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith in this manner. Sergeant First Class Smith was a loving husband and father, and now a hero. I urge swift passage of this resolution.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) particularly, and the leadership for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor as quickly as we have.

I too rise with great honor to support my bill, H.R. 4380, which will name the post office at 4737 Mile Stretch Drive in Holiday, Florida, the Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith Post Office. I cannot think of anything more fitting than to name the only post office in Holiday, Florida, after one of her bravest citizens, Sergeant First Class Paul Ray Smith. While Paul was many things to many people, he can be remembered best as a distinguished soldier and American hero and a great family man.

Paul was raised in Tampa, Florida, by a single mother who instilled the values of hard work and determination in Paul and his three siblings. Paul would later use these values in battle in Baghdad.

Paul attended the Tampa Vocational-Technical High School in 1989 and joined the U.S. Army following graduation. He served tours of duty in Saudi Arabia during the first Gulf War and during the Bosnia and Kosovo conflicts. Throughout his career, Sergeant Smith distinguished himself as a fine soldier. He was awarded five Army Commendation Medals, six Army Achievement Medals, a Kuwaiti Liberation Medal, a NATO Liberation Medal, two National Defense Service Medals, three Good Conduct Medals, a Sergeant Morales Club for his courageous actions during combat, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

His most valiant action as a soldier occurred on April 4, 2003, outside of Saddam International Airport in Baghdad. Sergeant Smith's unit, the Bravo Company of the Eleventh Engineer Battalion of the Third Infantry, was tasked with securing a prison for Iraqi prisoners of war at the Baghdad Airport, which had just been secured by American forces. Sergeant Smith immediately thought of the grassy courtyard he had seen that was encompassed by a tall stone wall and next to a tower that overlooked it.

He gave the orders to build a prison, not knowing that the tower and surrounding area was still occupied by members of the Iraqi Republican Guard. While Sergeant Smith and his men were working in the POW prison, they spotted members of the Republican Guard nearby. Paul called for a Bradley, which was at a nearby road block, and he prepared his men for engagement. Sergeant Smith took charge and led the effort while they waited for the Bradley, which would bring an intimidating fire force.

Even though Sergeant Smith and his men were outnumbered by more than two to one, they continued to fight back. Paul jumped on an Army vehicle and began firing a 50 caliber machine gun. He fired and reloaded and continued to fire. Sergeant Smith's determination and bravery gave him the strength to lead the fight until he was shot and killed.

Sergeant Paul Smith, Mr. Speaker, never wavered, he never questioned his decisions, and he never gave up. He fought the hard fight, and by doing so he saved the lives of all of his men and the more than 100 American soldiers in the surrounding area. For his efforts, Sergeant Smith has been nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor, the military's highest honor. As my colleagues know, the Medal of Honor is awarded in the name of Congress by the President of the United States. Only some 3,400 men and women who have distinguished themselves, as the famous words state, "at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty," have received the Medal of Honor since its inception in 1861. The last action in which the Medal of Honor was awarded was in 1993 posthumously, to two soldiers who died fighting in Somalia. Sergeant Paul Smith's courage under pressure and his undying honor to protect the men under his guard make him the perfect candidate for the Medal of Honor.

While Sergeant Paul Smith epitomizes the phrase "American hero" and will not be forgotten because of his fearlessness and conviction, he will always be remembered as a devoted husband, a loving father, and a deserving son and brother. Not only did he leave his men in the battlefield that day, but he also left behind his wife, Birgit, and their children, Jessica and David; his mother and stepfather, Donald and Janice Rvirre, and two sisters and a brother. I hope they understand the importance of what Paul did that day and know that America thanks him and his family for the incredible sacrifice he made.

Mr. Speaker, for these many reasons, I believe that naming the Holiday, Florida, post office, which is just miles from where the Smith family now resides, after Paul is just one small way we as Americans can show our appreciation for the most precious sacrifice Paul made for us and generations to come.

Ronald Reagan once said, "Freedom is never more than one generation

away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free."

Mr. Speaker, may Paul Ray Smith's memory be eternal, and may God bless the Smith family, and may God bless America.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge all Members to support H.R. 4380, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4380.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4766, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 710 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 710

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropria-

tions. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: Beginning with the colon on page 3, line 25, through "out" on page 4, line 6; section 717; and section 751. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against that amendment are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 710 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4766, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 2005, under an open rule, as is customary with annual appropriations measures. I am pleased that the normal open amendment process outlined in H. Res. 710 will allow any member to offer an amendment to the bill as long as it complies with the standing rules of the House.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate in the House on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. H. Res. 710 waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, except as specified in the resolution.

H. Res. 710 also provides that the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution may be offered only by a mem-

ber of the subcommittee designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. H. Res. 710 waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report.

The resolution gives the chair the ability to provide priority in recognition to those members who have preprinted amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This procedure will help the House in considering amendments in a more orderly manner. Finally, H. Res. 710 provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the work product of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA). He has done a good job in crafting this funding bill, especially as we face budgetary limitations, and the bill deserves the support of the House today.

With regard to the underlying legislation, I do want to briefly note that this appropriations bill provides for more than \$83 billion in funding. Included in this bill is \$43 million in higher funding levels for food safety and counterterrorism activities. Also included is an increase of \$20 million for BSE, or mad cow disease, detection and prevention activities.

We are also fulfilling the commitments to our food and nutrition programs with an increase in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program. This measure also provides an increase in funding for Agricultural Research Service, including full funding to complete construction of the National Centers For Animal Health.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for an open amendment process for consideration of the agriculture appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow for the consideration of H.R. 4766, the fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriations bill. This important bill provides funding for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, select programs at the Department of Health and Human Services, and other agriculture and nutrition-related programs at various Federal agencies.

Like the other fiscal year 2005 appropriations bills, this bill is grossly underfunded. The allocation for these important programs continues to be reduced each year. Even though this bill is 1 percent more than the amount requested by President Bush, it is still below last year's funding level; and, unfortunately, it is the farmers, children, pregnant mothers, and seniors who rely on these programs who are hurt by these low allocations.

The gentleman from Texas (Chairman Bonilla), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and the members of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies have made the best out of a bad situation. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) did the best he could by stretching the limited funds he was allocated to fund many of the programs that are important to the American people.

While I am disappointed that the allocation is low, and I will urge the conferees, once appointed, to do what they can to increase the funding for these important programs, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA); the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR); and the members of this subcommittee for doing the best they could with this bill.

Specifically, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and the entire committee for providing \$75 million for the George McGovern-Robert Dole Food For Education and Child Nutrition Program. This important and successful program provides nutritious meals to hungry children around the world in a school setting. The McGovern-Dole Program received only \$50 million last year, and I am very pleased that President Bush requested an increase for fiscal year 2005.

This program began as the Global Food For Education Initiative, a pilot program to use surplus American commodities to feed hungry children around the world. The pilot program received \$300 million and provided school breakfasts, school lunches, and other supplemental food to 7 million children in 38 countries.

The McGovern-Dole program, authorized in the farm bill, made this program permanent and subject to appropriations. While I support providing \$300 million for this program, which would restore funding for this program to the original level of the pilot program, I am pleased that this bill increases funding for the McGovern-Dole program over last year's level.

Mr. Speaker, I am not alone in supporting \$300 million for this program. In December, 102 members of this body sent a bipartisan letter to President Bush requesting that \$300 million be allocated for the McGovern-Dole program in fiscal year 2005.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2003.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge you to provide \$300 million in your Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Proposal for the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. We believe it is urgent to restore funding for this program at levels similar to those of the original pilot program.

We strongly believe this funding is critical for sustaining and expanding the McGovern-Dole Program in order to combat terrorism and to help build and consolidate democracy in the Middle East, southern Asia, the Near East, and in other regions critical to U.S. national security. As you are aware, the McGovern-Dole Program provides donations of U.S. agricultural products, as well as financial and technical assistance, for school feeding and maternal and child nutrition programs in low-income countries. We note that recommendations made by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in February 2002 on how to strengthen and improve the administration and implementation of school feeding programs were fully integrated into the law establishing the McGovern-Dole Program, enhancements that we believe contribute to its success.

Both the initial pilot program and the current McGovern-Dole Program have a proven track record at reducing the incidence of hunger among school-age children and improving literacy and primary education, especially among girls, in areas devastated by war, hunger, poverty, HIV/AIDS, and the mistreatment or marginalization of women and girls. School meals, teacher training, and related support have helped boost school enrollment and academic performance. McGovern-Dole nutrition and school feeding programs also improve the health and learning capacity of children both before they enter school and during the years of primary and elementary school.

In February 2003, the U.S. Department of Agriculture evaluated the McGovern-Dole pilot program and found significant positive results. Specifically—"The results to date show measurable improvements in school enrollment, including increased access by girls. In projects involving more than 4,000 participating schools, the WFP reports an overall enrollment increase exceeding 10 percent, with an 11.7 percent increase in enrollment by girls. The PVO's report an overall enrollment increase of 5.75 percent in GFE-participating schools. In some projects, increases in enrollment were as high as 32 percent compared with enrollment rates over the previous three years." (USDA, the Global Food for Education Pilot Program: A Review of Project Implementation and Impact, page 2 February 2003)

We firmly believe that these programs reduce the risk of terrorism by helping to eliminate the hopelessness and despair that breed terrorism. American products and commodities are directly associated with hunger alleviation and educational opportunities, encouraging support and good will for the United States in these communities and countries.

We strongly urge that you restore the capacity of this critically important program by providing \$300 million for Fiscal Year 2005.

Sincerely,

James P. McGovern, Frank Wolf, Jo Ann Emerson, Marcy Kaptur, Doug Bereuter, Tom Lantos, Earl Pomeroy, Amo Houghton, Barbara Lee, Sam Graves, Edolphus Towns, Don Manzullo, Vic Snyder, Jim Leach, Tammy Baldwin,

Christopher Smith (NJ), Marty Meehan, Doc Hastings (WA), Dennis Moore, George Nethercutt, John Olver, Jerry Moran (KS), Bennie G. Thompson (MS), Todd Tiahrt, Adam Schiff, David Price, Maurice Hinchey, James Oberstar, Betty McCollum, William Delahunt, Bob Filner.

Jan Schakowsky, Sheila Jackson Lee, Leonard Boswell, Gary Ackerman, George Miller, Dale Kildee, Julia Carson (IN), Albert Wynn, Carolyn Maloney, Bobby Rush, Diana Christensen, Raul M. Grijalva, Bob Etheridge, Pete Stark, Jim McDermott, Jim Matheson, Jerry Costello, Mike Capuano, Joseph Crowley, Susan Davis (CA), Rosa DeLauro, Martin Frost, Rick Larsen (WA), Sander Levin, Ed Markey, John Tierney, Lynn Woolsey, Donald Payne, Hilda Solis, Mike McNulty, Elijah Cummings, Mike Doyle, Joseph Hoeffel.

Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bernie Sanders, Sam Farr, Neil Abercrombie, Jim Marshall, Charles Gonzalez, Ruben Hinojosa, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Earl Blumenauer, Robert Wexler, Rob Andrews, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Jose Serrano, Maxine Waters, Lane Evans, Barney Frank, Ron Kind, Sanford Bishop, Jr., Sherrod Brown (OH), Henry Waxman, Steve Rothman, Nancy Pelosi, Dennis Kucinich, Tom Allen, Jim Moran (VA), Rick Boucher, Brad Sherman, Carolyn Kilpatrick, Lois Capps, Karen McCarthy, Patrick Kennedy (RI), Jane Harman, Alcee Hastings (FL), William Jefferson, Chris Van Hollen, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lynch, Charles Rangel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and others to work with the other body to further increase these funds as this bill moves into and through the conference committee.

This program is important, I believe, not only to helping feed hungry children around the world. I also believe it is important in combating terrorism because it gets to some of the root causes where terrorist groups go to recruit people to be involved in some of the terrible events that we have seen unfold over the last several years.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that the fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriations bill includes language blocking the FDA from spending money to enforce its ban on prescription drug reimportation.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a bipartisan majority of our colleagues supports the reimportation of prescription drugs. It is even clearer that the American people support reimportation. They are being gouged by the high cost of prescription drugs, and they deserve access to these lower-cost prescription drugs. The current Medicare drug card and prescription drug plan are hardly a panacea for the high cost of prescription drugs.

It is vital that we provide access, especially for our seniors, to these low-cost prescription drugs. Until we can repeal this misguided law and pass a genuine and real prescription drug benefit that will provide genuine and real relief for seniors who rely on these import medicines, reimportation in many

respects is our only option; but it is also our best option.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is underfunded. There is no doubt about that. It is underfunded because of misguided tax cuts for rich people and wasteful spending adopted by this administration and I would say by those who are running this House of Representatives. It is underfunded because in 3 short years they turned record surpluses into record deficits. Now the programs that require Federal funds and especially the people who rely on these programs are paying the price for these misguided policies.

The low allocation for this bill means that WIC, our most important nutrition and health program for pregnant mothers and newborn children, will not be fully funded. It means homeland security activities at USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service are underfunded. And it means rural water and waste programs and the rural single family housing direct loan program are funded below even last year's levels.

The policies enacted over the past few years, the tax cuts for rich people and the wasteful spending, are taking their toll on these programs. However, Mr. Speaker, having noted these concerns and reservations, I believe that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), have done the best they could with such an inadequate allocation. I commend them for this bill. I look forward to voting for it.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill. This is a good rule, and it is a good bill. The committee has worked to put together a bipartisan bill, and I believe that goal has been accomplished.

The bill provides critical funding for basic agricultural programs, but it goes farther than that. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, agricultural exports, land conservation and renewable energy, as well as food, drug, and medical safety. This bill will deliver benefits to every one of your constituents every day, no matter what kind of district you represent.

I would say to all Members that they can support this bill and tell all of their constituents that they voted to improve their lives while maintaining fiscal responsibility. Support the rule; support the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member on the committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me time and for all the attention that he, in particular, pays to this important bill on agriculture and the Food and Drug

Administration. I also wanted to thank the representative of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), today for this consideration under an open rule. We, therefore, support the rule. And to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), from the committee for as hard as he has worked along with all of us on both sides of the aisle in trying to bring this measure before the full House.

This bill obviously has been put together under some of the most trying budget circumstances that we have ever seen. When last year's bill came before us, I said we were trying to stuff a size 10 foot into a shoe that was actually size 7. This in our country that needed more than we could provide in that bill. This year we have a size 6 shoe, and we have a size 11 foot. And so we have many more needs than we can accommodate in this bill.

We literally had requests from Members from across our country, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of requests that we could simply not address. They are not addressed in this bill at all.

The discretionary portion of this bill totals \$16.772 billion, which is a reduction of \$67 million over this year, and compared to fiscal year 2003, a reduction of over \$1.1 billion. That is nearly a 6 percent reduction compared to 2 years ago.

□ 1745

That means that all the Members who came to us for water and sewer projects, rural water and sewer projects, we just simply could not meet the requests.

The Women, Infant and Children's food program, though, we have raised it from last year, is probably \$150 million short in view of the rising need around our country, the unevenness, of the economy and lackluster job creation. We just simply do not have adequate money in these bills to meet all needs.

At the same time, our country is now spending over \$100 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan. Imagine if we were able to take and divide that up and give every State in our Union an additional \$2 billion, \$2 billion that they could share with our localities that are short on funds. We seem to be able to find money for some things around the world. But then we do not find money for very other worthy needs across this Nation.

For example, in our Commodity Supplemental Food Program, we want to take surplus food commodities and give them to our food banks and to people who need them. We are about \$15 million short in that account, despite all the need across this country and the greater and greater numbers of people coming into our soup kitchens and our feeding kitchens all over this Nation.

Meanwhile, in this budget, we have been forced to put money into accounts to take care of what we call invasive

species, that is, all these little critters that are coming into our country for which there is no known biological control. The cost of this now totals hundreds of millions of dollars compared to 10 years ago. Whether it is the Asian Longhorned Beetle eating all those trees in Chicago and New York City or whether it is the Emerald Ash Borer in States like Michigan and Ohio, those invasive species are just eating their way through all the forest lands, with those cost burdens now being put on the taxpayer. We basically take this money from a very inadequate allocation and divert it in order to try to prevent additional damage, and really these costs should not be the responsibility of the localities and of the Federal Government but those commercial interests that caused the damage in the first place.

I just want to say that agricultural America, and rural small towns, are trying as hard as they can. They have always demonstrated a real vision toward the future. We hope that as this bill moves towards the Senate we will be able to fix some of the inadequacies that currently exist in this bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA), the chairman of our subcommittee, for his willingness to work across the aisle and to do the best we could, again with a size eleven foot bill when, in fact, we only have a shoe about size six. We just cannot meet all the needs that are being asked of us. But we have done the best we can.

I rise in support of the rule and ask the Members to vote for the rule and ultimately for the bill.

I will also say that when the bill comes to the floor for full consideration tomorrow we will be offering amendments in the area of biofuels, trying to help to generate new industry across this country, a renewable fuels industry in ethanol and biodiesel and some of the new alcohol based fuels we have not even invented yet.

We will have an amendment on Iraq and will bring to the attention of the country the misuse of the Commodity Credit Corporation back during the 1980s and 1990s which has led us to have to bail out banks in the Middle East as a result of what was done back then and potentially what could happen again by what is being proposed in this bill now.

We will have an amendment dealing with outsourcing of call centers by the Food Stamp Program, trying to bring those call centers back to the United States, to our own people who need work.

Finally, we may have amendments dealing with the reimportation of prescription drugs, and we want to keep the base amendment that we were able to insert at the subcommittee level, which is to allow the reimportation of drugs from nations like Canada so that our people can buy them at affordable prices. We want to be able to keep that in the bill.

We will have an amendment on the Farmers Market Promotion Program, trying to bring it to a level where it can serve a majority of our people.

So, again, I ask for the support of the membership on the rule, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

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

Let me just close by again saying I want to commend the work of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ranking Member KAPTUR) for doing the best they could with the low allocation. It is not their fault they had a low allocation. The fault lies with the President and the White House and the leadership of this Congress.

I think that during this debate I think we will hear a number of Members question their sense of priorities when, in fact, the need, especially in this area of agriculture, is so great, and yet we do not have the resources to be able to address all those challenges.

They have done a good job with not a lot of resources. They deserve to be commended.

We have no problem with this rule, and I would urge adoption of the rule, and I also will vote for this bill and hope that in conference that Members will be able to get the allocation up to a more reasonable level.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues support both the rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. 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 H.R. 4755 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4755.

□ 1753

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 4755) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to present the Legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 2005 to the House for consideration, and I want to start by thanking not just the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my ranking member, but I wanted to say thanks to all the subcommittee staff who have worked hard to make this bill possible: Liz Dawson, who is our Chief Clerk; Chuck Turner, our Staff Assistant; Kathy Rohan; Celia Alvarado; Tom Forhan; Tim Aiken; Bill Johnson; Heather McNatt; and Jennifer Hing.

I wanted to say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, that I have enjoyed working with him and working with all the subcommittee members. We have put together I think a good bill. We have had a number of amendments, some committee debate on it, and I think the product is a better bill because of that.

It is a bipartisan bill and somewhat noncontroversial. I am not aware of any angst that Members have; although I know everybody would improve it here or there, given the opportunity.

This bill actually funds the House of Representatives and all the various support agencies, including the Capitol Hill Police, the Architect of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office and the General Accounting Office.

The bill is \$2.7 billion, which does not include the Senate items; and traditionally we do not fill in the blanks for the Senate. They do not fill in the blanks for us.

The bill came in below the budget request and is basically flat, meaning that the size of it is about the same as what it was last year. It does, however, provide for the current staffing levels. It includes cost of living increases and other increases here and there for inflationary reasons. There are no deductions in force, and yet we have kept new initiatives off it and tried to defer funding on certain projects.

Overall, the bill started out with a request level of \$3.1 billion, and we were able to work that down to the \$2.7 billion.

My colleagues may also recall that the fiscal year 2004 bill was brought to the floor with a decrease from the 2003

levels. So the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations has done its best to practice fiscal restraint and try to keep the President's goal in mind of a 1 percent increase for nondefense and homeland security discretionary spending, and we are actually below that.

There are a number of important things in this bill, but what I might do is I see some Members are here to speak on it. At this point, I see the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, is here; and I will give him an opportunity to speak.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) has, in fact, been fair. We have worked out an appropriations bill that we can both live with. So this should not take an inordinate amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, there is some disagreement over the rule, and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) I know will be addressing a consideration of the rule, but that was not a matter that was left open to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) or myself. It was an amendment that might have been added.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) has an amendment that he would at least like to talk about, and I think it has considerable merit, but there are a lot of things that had considerable merit that are not included within this bill.

We had a very tight, tough 302(b) allocation; and it was felt that the Congress itself has to lead by example. Our original requests were not realistic. They would have increased spending in this appropriations bill by more than 14 percent above last year's spending level; and some of the major parts of this campus, the Capitol Police, the Architect of the Capitol, et cetera, had increases that were over 30 percent this year over last year. So they were not granted.

What we have before us is basically a flat bill. It is actually a .1 percent cut below last year's level. It is probably unprecedented. Maybe somebody is going to find an appropriation bill that was actually cut below the prior year, but I am skeptical that there is such a thing. I think all of us would have liked more money for a number of components of this bill, but it is responsible, and, as far as I am concerned, it is a fair bill. It covers in full, mandatory cost increases without resorting to any layoffs or RIFs.

In terms of percentages, the Office of the Attending Physician, who does a great job, Dr. Eisold and his colleagues are terrific and often called for in crisis situations, they receive a 13.7 percent increase, well justified, but the Open World Leadership Program, which I also think is well-justified, fared the worst with a 50 percent cut.

□ 1800

Hopefully, we will be able to restore some of that money in conference.

Now, somewhere in between those two ends of the spectrum, all the other legislative branch agencies, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Compliance, Government Printing Office, our own Members' Representational Allowance, they will receive considerably less than was requested, but certainly enough to carry out their primary responsibilities and missions.

The Capitol Police will be given approximately a 6 percent increase and additional flexibility to use unobligated funds from last year to cover most of their new equipment needs.

I am disappointed that this bill, though, does impose such a stiff cut to the Open World Leadership program, because it promotes democracy by bringing foreign leaders from Russia and other countries that were satellites of the Soviet Union to study our democratic institutions, something that is very much needed. And when we consider the relative costs if we do not get democracy embedded in those countries, it is substantially greater, obviously.

I am also troubled the public printer will lack the funds to modernize the functions of the Government Printing Office. But I am pleased that, despite the overall freeze, the chairman agreed, and I think we had the consensus of our subcommittee, that we should finally establish a staff fitness center. So I trust that the staff is going to be very pleased with that, and it is something that a number of us have been wanting to see go forward.

The Congress, of course, is the institution that is at the heart of this great Republic's democracy. A \$2.75 billion budget is less than .15 percent of the proposed total Federal budget. It is a small price to pay for a legislative body that represents the world's greatest democracy.

So while the bill is fair, we do fall far short of what we may need to do in the future to provide for this institution's needs, the people who work here, and the people who visit here. If we attempt to continue such a tight budget in future years, and I am afraid that the same justification is going to apply, with large looming deficits for the next decade, then this institution will truly suffer.

The flat funding we have in this budget will not be sustainable. It will trigger reductions in force, it will compromise security, it will render our now current computer information systems obsolete and ineffective, and it will undermine improvements in productivity and efficiency that will subsequently drive up future maintenance costs. Popular initiatives, like digitizing the Library of Congress' collections and sharing its wealth of literary material with the public, simply will not happen.

We cannot balance the budget by freezing the legislative branch's bud-

et. In fact, we cannot even balance the budget by freezing all of discretionary spending. So we do have some fundamental differences about our Nation's priorities, but those fall outside the scope of this committee. I am not going to dwell on them.

This year's appropriation bills mark the beginning of what in the past has been an abstract budget debate, but we are now getting into the real consequences of a budget resolution that I think is insufficient, and we are going to have to address those 302(b) allocations in the future.

Again, specifically, the legislative branch appropriation bill is a fair bill. I think it is reasonable and sustainable, at least for this year.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have a lot of good things in this bill. We had some good subcommittee and committee-level debates and a number of amendments. One such amendment actually encourages Members of Congress to lease or use hybrid fuel-efficiency cars. This amendment was debated and offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) and successfully put on it. He is here, and he is going to address that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I thank both the ranking member and the chairman for the work they do. Having served on this subcommittee for 6 years, I know the important work that they do.

Mr. Chairman, the American people probably do not pay a whole lot of attention to this bill, because a lot of it is inside the Beltway, but I know the American people are keenly aware of the rising cost of gasoline and the need for our country to be independent of energy sources and not so dependent on oil. And I do not want to encourage any extra government spending whatsoever.

A number of Members either take a mileage reimbursement for official travel, which is totally permissible under the rules, or they lease a vehicle at government expense. And in either case, this resolution encourages Members to use hybrid electric or alternatively fueled vehicles. Why? Because the American people expect us to lead. And a lot of them are asking what are we going to do about our dependence on foreign oil; what can we do to lower our cost of fuel.

In the past, the options have not been too good. But this fall, in this country, there are at least eight hybrid electric vehicles in the marketplace for American consumers, including domestic vehicles, from pickup trucks to SUVs, where you can double your gas mileage. The new Ford Escape, and I

have one on order, will get 38 miles per gallon. It is a small SUV. Throw your kids in the back, or if you are taking staff around the district, drive one of those. Or even a foreign model, if your constituents like that or will allow that. Some will not. But you have all the options, and we want to encourage this.

The resolution simply says it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of the House who use vehicles in traveling for official or representational purposes, including Members who lease vehicles for which the lease payments are made using funds provided under the Members' Representational Allowance, are encouraged to use hybrid electric or alternatively fueled vehicles whenever possible, as the use of these vehicles will help to move our Nation forward toward the use of a hydrogen fuel cell vehicle and reduce our dependence on oil.

We need to accelerate the transition to a hydrogen economy away from a petroleum-based economy, clean up the air, secure our liberty, and Members should lead by example. As the cochairman of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus here in the House, the Republican cochairman, with my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), we have over 228 to 232 Members, well over a majority of this body are members, we encourage the use of these hybrid electric vehicles, and it begins with us. Lead by example.

If my colleagues are taking the mileage or if you lease a vehicle, we encourage you to use these alternative-fuel vehicles, double your gas mileage, and move us towards a secure energy future. I commend the chairman for including this important language.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time, Mr. Chairman.

I rise to deal with one aspect of this bill, and that is that it does not impose, as I would like it to, a \$25,000 limit on the amount of postage spent by any one committee in any one year. That would be \$50,000 a Congress or \$25,000 as an annual limit.

After all, in the 107th Congress, encompassing 2002 and 2001, the average amount spent by the highest-spending committee was \$6,807. In fact, in looking at the entire history of this House, I cannot find an example where any committee prior to the 108th Congress ever needed to spend more than \$10,000 on postage.

A \$25,000 limit seems like it provides plenty of room, particularly for a country that faces the kinds of fiscal problems that we face. And yet, why would I even think it necessary in a House where no committee had until the 108th Congress spent even \$10,000 on postage, why would I think it necessary to come to this floor to seek a \$25,000 annual limit? The reason is that

one committee, and this could be the opening of Pandora's box, decided in the 108th Congress to engage in a program of mass mailings in selected Members' districts.

That committee, in the 107th Congress, spent an average of \$2,483, that is less than \$2,500 on postage. But in the 108th Congress, they came before the Committee on House Administration and asked for \$250,000 for postage for 1 year, and in fact asked for \$5 million on postage for the 2 years making up the 108th Congress.

So think of this. This is a 4,445 percent increase over what that same committee had requested for the prior Congress. But if that does not bother the fiscal conservatives in this room, reflect that it was a 9,968 percent increase over what that committee actually spent in the prior Congress.

Now, in fact, the Committee on House Administration did not provide for this one authorizing committee to have \$5 million for postage, but they did provide \$50,000 for 2003 and another \$50,000 for 2004. And this committee in fact spent \$49,587 on postage just in one invoice in December 2003. And, in fact, in order to have something to mail for \$49,000 in postage, they spent \$40,000 printing the material that was mailed, just to send out material into a very few Members' districts.

Now, the affected Members did not, to my knowledge, have any objection to the contents. But mark my words, this is the beginning. If we pass this legislative approps bill with no limits, then this one authorizing committee may come and ask for \$5 million on postage for the 109th Congress. They may ask for \$2 million or \$3 million in postage. Other committees may get in on the deal, and then we may have a circumstance where the Chair of each committee has a multi-million dollar postage slush fund to do mailings in the different Members' districts.

Now, how is this different for the Member communications that we are all aware of? Because we all mail into our own districts newsletters, et cetera. Well, first, each Member gets a limited MRA. In contrast, the amount that could be provided under this leg approps bill for a single committee to do mass mailings is unlimited.

Secondly, and I think this is the most important difference, every mailing says published and mailed and printed at government expense, so that the recipients of the mailing can hold the author accountable. If I am sending out useless mailings to my constituents, they can circle that line and remember it when the ballot box is in play.

In contrast, if a Chair mails into my district or mails into another Member's district, and the recipients of that mailing think that it is useless, that it is highly political, that it is propaganda, that it is on a subject they are not interested in, what recourse do they have?

I guess they could pick up and move to the district of the Chair who sent

out the mailing. But assuming they are unwilling to move from one part of the country to the other, they have no recourse. So once we have Chairs sending out mailings, these mailings have no check on them. There is no accountability, and there is no way for the recipients to register their belief that the mailing is useless.

In addition, MRA funds are distributed equally to Members regardless of their political party. But if we see \$5 million appropriated by this bill allocated to a particular chairman to do mass mailings into Members' districts, that will be entirely money for one party and zero for Members of the other party.

Now, I want to stress my proposal here is bipartisan. In fact, it is designed to affect Democratic chairmen. That is to say, it affects the 2005 fiscal year, when I hope and expect Democratic Chairs will be the ones that will be able to do these mass mailings. But I do not care whether it is Democrats or Republicans. We should not have mass mailings going out by Chairs. That is why I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from the National Taxpayers Union and another from Citizens Against Government Waste.

□ 1815

Each of them says that we ought to limit to \$25,000 a year as a first step the amount spent on postage by any committee. This marks the first time that any legislative proposal of mine has been formally endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union and by Citizens Against Government Waste.

I know that people will want to come to this floor and reflexively vote against any motion to recommit, at least members of the majority, but your vote determines whether you endorse opening Pandora's box to unlimited mailings.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
Alexandria, VA, July 12, 2004.

HON. BRAD SHERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHERMAN: On behalf of the 350,000-member National Taxpayers Union (NTU), I am responding to your request for NTU's views on a proposal to limit each Committee's expenditure on postage to the sum of no more than \$25,000 per year.

Even as overall postage and printing expenditures have declined from the \$100 million-plus levels once seen in Congress 15 years ago, franking remains a source of fiscal and political interest to NTU. The already-generous limits governing the use of postage by House Members' personal offices were lifted in 1999, while new computer technologies have allowed lawmakers to maximize the impact of their mailings in ways that were not feasible as recently as ten years ago. Today, it is still possible for an incumbent House Member to spend as much on franking in a year as a challenger spends on his or her entire campaign. Rules regarding the content and proximity of mailings to elections only modestly offset this tremendous political advantage.

During our 15-year campaign on behalf of franking reform, NTU has focused on Member offices because they are the primary

source of unsolicited mass mailings and associated expenditures. We were thus surprised to learn of a single Committee's FY 2005 postage request for \$250,000 in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill.

NTU is greatly concerned over the prospect of any Committee in Congress receiving postage fundings in these amounts, as it would mark a significant expansion of the franking privilege that had traditionally been utilized in large part by Member offices. Such concern is irrespective of the immediate policy issue at hand or the parties involved. If the House sets a budget precedent now, taxpayers will very shortly face the unwelcome prospect of tens of millions in additional franking expenditures in future Congresses. Equally, important Americans would be forced to contend with a new set of issues affecting the balance of the political process.

Years of efforts from groups like NTU and reformers within Congress have yielded an improved, yet imperfect, franking disclosure process. Despite instances of poor record-keeping, inadequate disclosure, and overly-permissive rules, today constituents at least have limited access to basic franking information—giving them a chance to hold House Members politically accountable for the unsolicited mass mailings they send into their districts at taxpayer expense. Allowing such a practice at the Committee level, where ties between Members and constituents are less direct, would undermine even this limited progress.

It is especially galling that Congress would even consider an additional taxpayer-financed expansion of the franking privilege under the current fiscal and political circumstances. Amidst FY 2005 budget deficit estimates approaching \$400 billion, and a campaign finance law that further hamstringing political challengers, allowing such a huge postage funding request for any Committee will further reinforce Congress's reputation as an institution incapable of self-restraint.

Given the historical patterns of Committee expenditures, a \$25,000 annual limit on postage for each Committee is more than adequate for any legitimate communication needs. Seemingly minor budget requests such as the one before Congress now can have major consequences for taxpayers in the not-too-distant future. For this reason alone, the House of Representatives can and should restrict Committee postage expenditures—and a \$25,000 annual limit is a reasonable first step.

Please feel free to contact me should you have an additional questions regarding our position.

Sincerely,

PETE SEPP,
Vice President for Communications.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS
AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
July 12, 2004.

Representative BRAD SHERMAN,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Of-
fice Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SHERMAN: The more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste would like to express their appreciation for your cost-saving effort to limit each Committee to spending \$25,000 a year on postage.

Sincerely,

THOMAS SCHATZ,
President.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to respond to my friend from California a little bit.

Number one, this, as we all know, is an appropriation bill; and the proper place to deal with a franking issue, of course, would be on an authorizing bill. I hope that our friend is taking his concerns to the proper committee, which would be the Committee on House Administration.

But I also wanted to say, in the spirit of good government, what I would like to see is Members of Congress and the institution going out into America, into the States a little bit more. As I understand it, talking to some committee chairmen, they actually use this franking privilege in their field hearings.

I sit on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. I used to be on the Committee on Agriculture. What is more important than our food policy out there? If we had the Committee on Agriculture going out and talking about the dairy program or the peanut program or whatever, sending out letters to people to say, come to this congressional hearing that is going to be in your neighborhood, come raise Cain with your Congressman, I think that would be a good thing.

Certainly the Committee on Ways and Means, the taxing committee, my folks down in the little briar patch that I represent would love to go out and, frankly, raise hell with everybody that writes our tax policy.

Then there is the Committee on Energy and Commerce. They control telecommunications. We passed several years ago the slamming bill. That is something that I know has affected a lot of people. If there was an opportunity for the common, everyday citizen to go to a field hearing and raise Cain about how slamming was done on their phone service, I think that would be a healthy thing.

I am not sure that a \$25,000 limit would be good enough to have people come, but I think what we need is more sunshine and more public input. That is why I am hesitant to accept the \$25,000 limit just on face value because I know that these notices are important. But I also know, Mr. Chairman, that the committees who use these have them signed off by the minority and the majority party and so there is a system of fairness.

Again, in terms of fiscal restraint, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for getting an endorsement from the National Taxpayers Union, but I also want to say that this bill, we are very happy to say, is flat funding, if not a little less than last year. So we are with him at least on that angle.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who has come up through the ranks as a former staffer and worked very hard and continues to work hard on staff quality of life. One of the issues that we are facing, we lose lots of staff here on Capitol Hill. The gen-

tleman from Illinois has worked tirelessly to protect the quality of life for somebody who works here.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time and for his leadership on the Subcommittee on Legislative. I certainly rise in support.

I would ask Members, after reviewing the amendments, to vote against the amendments. I think the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) have worked very hard on this bill to make sure it is the right mix of staffing for the House of Representatives, the right mix of staffing for our law enforcement personnel, the right mix for the Library of Congress and for all those who serve the Members of Congress.

I know Members like to take the opportunity from time to time when they have a complaint maybe against another Member or against another committee or somebody else to come to the floor and use this bill to try and carry out some kind of a complaint or a gripe that they have. This is not the bill to do it. I would urge Members to vote against the amendments that are being proposed.

As a member of the subcommittee, I have worked very hard over the last several years on the issue of improving the quality of life for employees of the House of Representatives, particularly as it relates to their health care, particularly as it relates to the issue of whether our employees of the House of Representatives should have some kind of health fitness center similar to the kind of center that we have for Members where staff, who work here pretty much 24/7 when we are in session, can have the opportunity to go and to work out and to keep healthy. We have accomplished that goal.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership in providing the funding in this bill and also the gentleman from Virginia, who obviously represents a lot of the employees, for his leadership for including the money so that we can begin, once this bill is signed by the President, to have the construction of a health fitness center for our employees for the House of Representatives.

This is an important issue. There is a lot of talk about obesity and health care and how do we all stay healthy. Working around here is very, very demanding. I can think of no other opportunity that we can provide to our hard-working employees than an opportunity to have a place to stay healthy, to be healthy and to have it right here on the premises.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), too, for his leadership. As a former staffer, he also worked hard around here and continues to work hard on behalf of the staff.

I just want to say a word about the people that make all of us look good, the people that are gathered here in the House Chamber, the Parliamentar-

ians, the lawyers, the doctors, the police, the law enforcement who work here 24/7 to make sure that we are well protected, that we are well taken care of, that every word that we speak is taken down. There are so many people that work in the House complex that average, ordinary citizens, certainly taxpayers, never see, but they help make this institution what it is, the great institution that it is, in terms of our ability to do our work and pass bills and make new laws and solve problems in the country. We could not do it without the many wonderful employees that work so hard on behalf of the Members of the House of Representatives. My hat is off to them.

This bill is the bill that takes care to make sure they have the equipment, make sure they have the information and the means to do their jobs. In supporting this bill and asking Members to look carefully at the amendments and rejecting the amendments because of the good work that has gone on by the chair and the ranking member, I say to the employees of the House of Representatives, job well done, and this is our way of saying thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to serve on this committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), another distinguished member of the subcommittee who is also a former staffer, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) said, and has worked on not just the issue of quality of life for staffers and the gym but also one that has to do with our security around here, the Capitol Hill police, the use of horses, among other things.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member for their strong leadership.

As a former staffer, the construction of a staff gym is one I am very proud to see move forward. Congress spends a lot of money each year on programs to promote physical fitness and to fight obesity. Finally, the Congress is doing that right here. This legislation includes a \$3 million fund for the construction of a staff gym located in the Rayburn garage. Along with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who has advocated this for so long, we have finally begun the process of the construction of a staff health and fitness center because it is time to give our staffs the same opportunities that Members have right here.

We employ over 17,000 people in the legislative branch. Any employer of that size in Chicago would have long provided such facilities to their employees. The staff gym gives men and women who serve here in the House the opportunity to be fitter and be able to better handle the stress of their jobs, handling the long hours and under sometimes low-paying conditions working for our constituents.

I want to thank the subcommittee staff, especially Liz Dawson for her work in making this a reality.

During the subcommittee markup, another issue was addressed to halt funding for the Capitol Police mounted horse unit. I offered an amendment to deny funding because of fiscal constraints in the face of security threats. It is imperative that we invest funds in protecting the Capitol and spend them wisely. I applaud the Capitol Police for their cooperative work with law enforcement agencies to minimize the threat but do not believe that investing taxpayer dollars in 18th century technology represents fiscal responsibility.

We should not fund a program that has so many unresolved issues. A perfect example is the issue of quartering horses on the Capitol grounds. Last year, the committee was told the horses would be using Park Police stables on the far side of the mall. At very little expense, they were supposed to be housed close to the Capitol complex. However, that is not happening.

Currently, the Capitol Police horses are stabled at a Bureau of Land Management facility on Gunston Road in Lorton, Virginia, 1 hour's drive with trailers from the Capitol. The Architect of the Capitol does not have a current cost estimate for constructing a stable or handling manure on the new location, but the K-9 kennel construction cost over \$1 million, and one could easily hazard a guess that horse stables would cost even more than the K-9 facility that we have built. If the program continues, Congress would have to pay for use of the BLM facilities or constructing an entirely new horse stables and waste disposal system at taxpayer expense. By blocking funding for a new mounted unit, the committee has taken the action to save taxpayers approximately \$1.8 million over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this legislation. I thank the ranking minority member and the chairman for their work on this legislation.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, just to quickly respond to the gentleman from Georgia who argues that these mass mailings by committees are justified.

If we do not have a limit, they will grow. What was a \$500,000 request this time may be a \$1 million request or a \$2 million request for the 109th Congress. Never before the 108th Congress has any committee ever needed more than \$10,000.

The idea of having a field hearing as a reason to mail out a districtwide mailing, or several districtwide mailings, is relatively absurd. If the field hearing is really of interest, the press will publicize that field hearing; and people will come if they are interested. A field hearing has never in the history of this House up until this Congress been used as an excuse for mass propaganda into a Member's district; and if the gentleman thinks it should be, that

is a revolutionary change. It is not one I would like to see in the 109th Congress.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend from California, I understand he has a motion to recommit, and we will debate it a little bit more then, but I certainly think there is a lot to say about it. Again, one of our things is that the Committee on House Administration needs to be doing the authorizing on that.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does have a lot of good things in it. It includes one thing that I did not mention, that we are asking the Architect of the Capitol to contract out the management of the Capitol power plant as a private entity. We are doing that in the spirit of how can we lead the way to continue to make the Capitol a little more efficient.

We are also asking for a review of the legislative branch agencies. Some of the heads of these agencies are appointed by the President. Some have a 10-year term. Some have a 14-year term. Some have the approval of the Senate. Some have the approval of the Senate and the House. We just think that it is time to review some of these things. They have a different retirement program.

There are a lot of proposals out there. The Capitol Hill Police Chief, for example, for whom I have a lot of respect, has suggested that we build a wall around the U.S. Capitol. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), among others, has made sure that we have language in our bill to say that we do not want a wall around the U.S. Capitol compound. We want people to be able to get in here.

We have taken a look at everything under our jurisdiction in a very serious way and just asked the questions, can we do it better? I will submit many of the changes that we have recommended for the record.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be the last speaker before we move to amendments, unless the gentleman from Georgia would like to offer some concluding remarks.

Again, I will summarize what I said earlier. It is a fair bill. I thank the gentleman from Georgia very much. I want to thank Liz Dawson of the majority staff. The Democratic staff person has been Tom Forhan, who has done an excellent job, and Tim Aiken, my legislative director.

□ 1830

I have got a whole list here, and I ought to mention them. Chuck Turner deserves mentioning, Kathy Rohan, Clelia Alvarado, and I have already mentioned the others, and Heather McNatt. I thank them.

Again, I want to say a word about something that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) mentioned, this business of the mounted police on the Cap-

itol. I wholly agree with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the chairman. I do not think this is a necessary adjunct to our Capitol Police. I think it is a strange and illogical addition, in fact, and particularly when I learned that the Capitol Police have to spend what must be a good hour driving down to the BLM property on Gunston Road. I was involved with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) in setting that aside for the Bureau of Land Management. I am very much familiar with it. But I never imagined it would be housing horses that had to be deployed on the Capitol grounds. So they pick up the horses. They schlep the poor horses all the way back to the Capitol for a few hours, I guess, galloping around, and then they schlep them all the way back to this BLM property down in Lorton, Virginia, down Route 1. It is congested; so it is bumper to bumper. That is almost inhumane in itself, but it is certainly inefficient and a strange use of our resources. I am glad that that was eliminated.

There are a number of things that we chose not to fund, but I think in subsequent years are probably going to have to be funded. As I said, I know a .1 percent cut in the legislative branch appropriations bill is not reasonable in the long term, although we can clearly get along with it this year.

I do hope we will restore the Open World Leadership program in conference. We do have dental and vision benefits for the people who work here in the legislative branch, and that is an appropriate thing to do, and it is largely consistent with what we do with the executive branch. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is going to have an amendment with regard to science and technology. We do need a resource to avail ourselves of when it comes to scientific and technological issues which change every day, and we really do need a good deal of expertise to assist us in that. But he is going to have an amendment to address that issue.

With that, I think we can go on to the amendments, and I suspect shortly we will have a full complement of House Members to be able to vote.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on H.R. 4755, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005. This is the sixth bill we are considering pursuant to the 302(b) allocations adopted by the Appropriations Committee on June 9. I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established in the conference report to S. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005, which the House adopted as its fiscal blueprint on May 19. Conforming with a long practice—under which each chamber of Congress determines its own needs—appropriations for the other body are not included in the reported bill.

H.R. 4755 provides \$2.751 billion in new budget authority, which is within the 302(b) allocation to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative and outlays of \$2.92

billion. The bill contains no emergency-designated new budget authority, nor does it include rescissions of previously enacted appropriations.

Accordingly, the bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

I commend Chairman KINGSTON's remarks in the accompanying report underscoring the fact that with record deficits, a war on terrorism, troops on the ground in Afghanistan and Iraq, the budget request from agencies of the legislative branch cannot continue to be presented with requested increases as high as 50 percent. I welcome his efforts and the efforts of other members of the Appropriations Committee as we try to hold discretionary spending to a reasonable level.

In reading the final version of this bill I noted that the accompanying report directs the General Accounting Office to review the statutory responsibility and overlap of the jurisdiction of joint committees of Congress, the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Service. We should pause before we ask one congressional agency to examine the jurisdiction of other congressional agencies and committees of Congress. Also, it might not be appropriate for GAO to assume this role when it may duplicate the functions of some of the agencies it is being charged with evaluating.

With that reservation, I express my support for H.R. 4755.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to announce that I am going to vote for H.R. 4755, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2005, for one simple reason: It provides enough resources for the legislative branch agencies to fulfill their responsibilities to the American people during the coming fiscal year.

First, I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman KINGSTON and especially Ranking member MORAN for all of their hard work on this legislation. Mr. MORAN and Tim Aiken of his staff, as well as Tom Forhan of Mr. OBEY's staff, worked closely with my staff and me on a number of issues in this bill and this cooperation is much appreciated.

In the aggregate, the bill holds legislative branch spending, excluding the Senate items that are not before us, at \$2.4 million below the level of new budget authority provided for fiscal 2004. Despite holding at last year's spending level, the Committee on Appropriations has managed to fund the agencies' mandatory increases, including an expected 3.5 percent Federal wage adjustment, and avoid requiring agencies to lay off employees. The Committee was also able to achieve significant savings, year-on-year, because it has benefited from non-recurring items from last year, deferred new capital projects and delayed others. This is appropriate, since our Federal budget deficit has reached mammoth proportions in just 4 years' time. It is hard for me to imagine that when I first came to this House, in January 1999, the Federal budget was in surplus. Today, our Federal deficit has reached massive proportions, eclipsing those considered horrendous in 1990 when the first President Bush was in office. The legislative branch must expect to participate in efforts to reduce that deficit, and this bill strikes an appropriate balance in this regard.

While I will support the bill, I want to highlight several matters of interest to me as the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, which has authorizing jurisdiction over several accounts funded in the measure, and others.

First, I join with the Appropriations Committee in commending the staff of the numerous entities who helped to make last month's state funeral for President Reagan an occasion of which the entire legislative branch could be proud. Without the tireless efforts of countless individuals in the office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police, the Government Printing Office, the Capitol Guide Service, the Attending Physician's Office, as well as the House and Senate leadership, committees, and others, Americans could not have paid proper respects to their former President. On behalf of my constituents in Connecticut, I wish to thank all of the dedicated legislative branch employees who made that funeral possible.

I also thank the Appropriations Committee for its report language encouraging legislative agencies with respect to their employees' use of the transit-subsidy program. Wherever we can encourage Federal employees in the Washington area, and elsewhere, to use mass transit, we can not only clean the air, reduce traffic congestion, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil, I believe we can make our employees more productive. The program works here in the House and elsewhere, and I am pleased the Appropriations Committee expressed its continuing support.

At total funding of \$1.1 billion, including the House office buildings, the bill provides sufficient funds for the people's House. I am delighted that the Appropriations Committee has found \$3 million to establish a new in-house fitness facility for staff, made a reality through the efforts of the gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and Virginia (Mr. MORAN), both of whom are devoted to the health and welfare of all our dedicated employees. I am also pleased that the Committee eliminated the prohibition on exploring options for developing a supplemental vision and dental benefit for Members and employees. Many House staff have expressed interest in the availability of such benefits, for which they would pay.

I appreciate the work of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who recently discovered that the chief administrative officer was improperly making prepayments for certain Web-related services. Federal law generally prohibits pre-payments for Federal services, and the CAO has moved swiftly to address the problem in his Finance Office.

Finally, I hope the sense-of-the-House language included by the Committee at the behest of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), encouraging the use of hybrid and alternative-fueled vehicles wherever possible, will indeed spur the use of these cutting-edge technologies so important to our Nation's future.

This bill provides adequate funds for the Capitol Police for the coming year, and eliminates funding for its new mounted unit. Mounted patrols may make sense for the U.S. Park Police, which must operate in the many thousands of forested acres of Rock Creek Park in northwest Washington. But in my judgment, horses, though perhaps harkening back to the "Charge of the Light Brigade," make little

sense in the comparatively small, confined, clean and manicured urban park that is the Capitol grounds, given the animals' unavoidable by-products. I also agree with the Committee, which included language prohibiting the study or construction of a fence around the Capitol grounds at this time. The people's House must not, even symbolically, erect a barrier between itself and the people we represent.

I am glad this bill authorizes the Office of Compliance to institute a student-loan repayment program. Similar programs, including those established recently in the House and Senate, are designed to help agencies attract and retain qualified employees, and the Compliance Office's needs for talented staff are no different.

The Library of Congress will receive adequate funding overall under the bill, enabling it to continue fulfilling its important missions. I appreciate the Committee's decision to provide level funding of \$14.8 million for the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center in Culpeper, VA. I hope the relevant committees will take whatever action may be required in order to reauthorize the National Film Preservation Board and the National Film Preservation Foundation, so this important work can continue unabated. The pending bill does not include the \$500,000 provided for these activities last year, because the authorizations have expired. There is ample time to reauthorize it before this bill becomes law.

I am pleased that the Committee also provided adequate funding for the coming year for the Government Printing Office, which has faced financial trouble. Our House Administration Committee convened an oversight hearing on April 28. We heard from the new Public Printer, Bruce James, who has exciting ideas for how GPO, which has made great strides in the last decade, can continue moving forward in the electronic age. Labor witnesses expressed concerns about Mr. James's plans, and about spending at the agency, which must run like a business and generally earn its keep. I hope the differing views expressed by Mr. James and labor at our hearing, and thereafter, reflect a misunderstanding of each other's goals for the agency in these challenging times.

Finally, the Appropriations Committee report includes several far-reaching assignments for the General Accounting Office, directing that agency to examine every legislative branch agency in search of savings and efficiencies, including by "outsourcing" of agency functions where appropriate. While I am willing to consider every reasonable way to save the public money in these times of massive Federal budget deficits caused largely by the policies of the present Administration, "outsourcing" is hardly reasonable if the term means transferring the performing of inherently governmental functions overseas. I trust the Committee does not mean to suggest, for example, that government printing should be performed overseas.

I thank the Appropriations Committee for its work, and look forward to working with the Committee on these and other matters in the months remaining in this session.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 108-590. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108-590.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HOLT:

Page 20, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 33, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 38, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would add \$30 million to the salaries and expenses account of the General Accounting Office for the development of Scientific and Technology Assessment. This is something that is vital to us here in Congress. It would meet a bipartisan need of Congress to receive more objective expert and timely advice on the scientific and technological aspects of the issues before us. My amendment would avoid creating any new government agency or bureaucracy, but it would provide Congress with reputable and partial timely advice and analysis of emerging scientific and technological issues.

This is something that was, until 10 years ago, offered by an in-house agency. That is no longer available to us, but the GAO has begun on a pilot basis assuming some of this need and providing us with scientific and technological assessment. Not to have that today is hampering us in doing our work. So this certainly should be added to the appropriation.

It would enable Congress to understand the scientific and technological aspects of current and future legislative choices, be they in homeland security or national defense or medicine or telecommunications, agriculture, transportation, computer science. This is not just science for science's sake. This is to look at those scientific and technological aspects that are present

in virtually everything we do here in Congress.

When the Office of Technology Assessment was operating until a decade ago, they produced studies in such areas as colorectal cancer screening, teachers in technology, Super Fund actions, wage record information system, defense of medicine and medical malpractice, grain dust explosion, policy with regard to antibiotic-resistant bacteria. The GAO in the last couple of years, picking up on this need that is currently unmet, has begun with some studies in the areas, for example, of biometrics, protecting against cyberattack. They have under way studies looking at smuggling of weapons of mass destruction and containing forest fires.

I do not think there is anyone in this body who could argue that we do not need to be well informed in such areas. Whether it is aviation safety or AIDS education or Alzheimer's disease or testing in American schools, we need technological assessment. This legislation, this amendment to this appropriations bill, would provide that through the organ of the General Accounting Office.

Because there has been resistance to reviving OTA, the Office of Technology Assessment, as it was, a number of us have been exploring other approaches, recognizing that every year that goes by without this capacity for in-house technological assessment represents lost opportunities, opportunities to save lives, to protect our towns and cities, and to commercialize new discoveries. This amendment will provide that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, when I came to Congress a number of years ago, I served on the OTA with the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and the bipartisan group that made the decisions. There were four Democrats, four Republicans from the Senate and the House. It was not a partisan committee. It was a committee set up to give us good advice.

A decision was made in 1994 to disband that, and we have since that point been really operating more on ideology I think sometimes than on real scientific bases. We need that. We appropriate billions of dollars on issues like treatment of AIDS and what are appropriate kinds of energy questions, and we have no knowledge except for the prejudices of one or another Member about what it is. It is very helpful to have a nonpartisan group to whom we can hand that problem to and say look, at this issue, tell us where we can make the best decisions.

And I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for doing this. I think that we need it, and it is time that we get back on a scientific footing in this Congress.

Virtually every issue facing America today has roots in science and technology.

From battling terrorism, to alternative fuels, from fighting HIV/AIDS, to stem cell research, not a day goes by that we don't rely on science and technology.

Yet, virtually every day, critical decisions involving science and technology are being made using a hodge-podge of data and opinion from well-intended groups. They often lack the resources and scientific expertise to provide the in-depth analysis we need.

There's nothing wrong with opinion, but it is not a substitute for empirical data and analysis.

We've got too much at stake as a nation to let things continue this way.

Congress needs credible data. The nation needs confidence that we are making decisions based on evidence and not conjecture.

Today the General Accounting Office provides independent, bi-partisan reports to Congress.

It's time science and technology gets the same level of attention.

The GAO is a great working model, so let's use it as the home for a Center for Science and Technical Assessment.

We can't hope we get it right when we make a decision.

There's far too much at stake to do anything but recognize we have a problem and a solution is at hand.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to certainly thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this up, as he has spoken to me many times about it. However, I am unable to support it at this time, but I wanted to compliment him. I understand in his district there is a popular bumper sticker that says: "My congressman is a rocket scientist," and I think probably the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and maybe the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), who is our one member of the Fulbright Scholarship Alumni Association, have some of the greatest intellectual capacity of this body.

However, some background in terms of the Office of Technology Assessment. In 1995 on a bipartisan level, we eliminated it, and the belief at that time was that there were other committees that we could turn to to get technology studies and technology assessment. Some of these, for example, are the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, the Institute of Medicine, and the National Research Council. All of them have hundreds of people who are technically educated. And then in addition to that, there are 3,273 people at the General Accounting Office and 729 at the Congressional Research Service. We have not suffered because of the loss of technology assessment. It is perhaps true that we could rearrange some of the food on the plate and make sure that it does not get shuffled to the back burner; but if my colleagues think about it, Mr. Chairman, we actually have thousands of people out there

doing studies, and we just need to make sure that this does not fall through the cracks.

As a result of eliminating the Office of Technology Assessment, we have saved \$274 million, which is serious money in tight budget times, and that is money that we can put into many other worthy causes; and, of course, that is what the debate is all about.

In terms of the specifics of the Holt amendment, it reduces the Architect's office \$15 million and the printing office another \$15 million; and the problem with that is in terms of the Architect, we are actually almost 13 percent below their budget request. If we did cut them an additional \$15 million, it would be a 19 percent reduction, which would result in the RIF, or the reduction in force, of about 67 people, and this comes from the Architect's office; and it would slow down a number of the projects that they are working on. And goodness knows, one of the projects that we want to get finished as a committee is the Capitol Visitors Center. We want to get that done as quickly as possible. A reduction of 67 people could hurt making those deadlines.

In terms of the printing office, we have reduced this account by about 2 percent below last year's level. If we accept the Holt amendment, it would result in an additional cut of 17 percent. And these are things that have to be done anyhow, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, bills, resolutions, amendments, hearing volumes and reports and so forth; and that is what the printing office does with that.

So with those words, Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to reject the Holt amendment.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Holt amendment to create the Center for Scientific and Technical Assessment.

In this day and age it is imperative that Members of Congress understand technology and the rapidly changing world of innovative advances. But what we really need is fair and balanced information to make those decisions.

This new initiative is a bipartisan office that will quickly respond to Congress and our inquiries into new technology. This office will provide Congress with the basic on how the technology works, how new technology integrates with current policy, how the new technology will affect business.

This office is vitally important because if Congress makes the wrong decision or advances the wrong technology we could set our country back a few years. We could hurt business and let our international competitors take over a technology sector. We could slow innovation and hurt what is still one of our greatest economic engines which is the research and development of new technology.

I ask my colleagues to support the Center for Scientific and Technical Assessment so that we are all educated when we make decisions on technology and technology policy.

I ask my colleagues to support the Holt amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-590.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

□ 1845

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, first of all, to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia (Chairman KINGSTON) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), for crafting a bill that actually spends less money than it did last year. My amendment is not in any way intended to slight the chairman or ranking member. They are good friends and work hard at this, and they have done in many respects an excellent job. I know it is a difficult task to draft, and I want to express my appreciation for their hard work.

However, I am going to offer again, as I have on many of the other appropriations bills, an amendment to cut the bill by 1 percent. I know in committee how it works. In committee, it is difficult to get these bills out, and you have to get them out. So you make compromises, and you give a little here and you give a little there, and they usually come out, in my opinion, at least at a higher figure than is desirable if we are serious about trying to balance the budget.

So we do the best we can in committee and bring it to the floor, and I am asking for us to consider cutting one penny on every dollar so we can move towards that elusive idea of a balanced budget. If we would do just

this 1 percent on each of the appropriations bills, it would have a tremendous impact on moving towards that balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage an aye vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend from Colorado that, as he knows, I always appreciate his "let's go at it one more time and try to find some more money to reduce," and I have in the past supported a number of the Hefley amendments. This one, however, I find myself on the opposite side of and have to oppose.

The reason I have to oppose this, Mr. Chairman, is that we on the House control the House side. The Senate controls the Senate side. If we were to accept the Hefley amendment, this would tie one of our hands behind our back in terms of a level playing field with the Senate. This would result in a \$10 million cut to the House.

One of the problems that we have as House Members is we often lose our staff to the Senate because they see bigger responsibility, bigger title, but most importantly, bigger salary, and we have to keep our salary levels up in order to maintain good people on the House side. That alone makes me say I think we have to hold off on this.

There are other reductions that would come from this bill, I think approximately \$27 million total, so another \$17 million would come out of the Architect and the Library of Congress and so forth. But we have already cut those from their requests, in many cases from their last year's funding level, and I am not sure we could get another \$17 million out of there. If we could go back and find it, though, I would certainly support the Hefley amendment, but at this point we are not able to do so.

I want to point out one example. We are trying to privatize the power plant, which we think it would be a good thing in terms of streamlining the Office of the Architect. Things like that we are doing in the spirit of fiscal restraint, and we are going to continue on that pathway. But, unfortunately, at this time we have to reject his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to the amendment as well, although I share the very deep respect and warm regard for the author of the amendment.

I concede that 1 percent is not a whole lot of money in the scheme of

things, but the fact is that your own chairman has very skillfully already cut the spending in this bill.

As was said, this bill is already \$395 million below what was requested, so I think we want to acknowledge and almost reward the committees when they do cut below last year's level. Imagine, it is below last year's appropriation level, and the fact is that it is as low as we can go, because if it goes any more, even a 1 percent cut will trigger reductions in our workforce.

We are also told it would compromise our plans to upgrade security, and it would slow down or cancel investments to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the legislative branch's operations.

It is based on two assumptions, which I think we are going to find are not entirely the case. One is that the large budget deficits in growth in Federal spending is the exclusive result of discretionary spending increases. That is not the case. And, two, that there is enough waste, fraud and abuse that a 1 percent cut could actually improve government efficiency. I think we are going to find that is not the case as well.

The fact is that discretionary spending is the one portion of the Federal budget that has grown the least and is subject to the greatest level of scrutiny and control by the Congress through our appropriations bills.

I have to say, we ought to be boasting about the fact that we have the most honest and professional public employee workforce in the world. I am proud of the people who toil long hours to serve our needs and ensure that this body operates efficiently and effectively. Any waste, fraud and abuse that exists is far more likely to be the result of conflicting, outdated or inconsistent Federal policies.

I cannot understand why we are spending taxpayer money on many other things that I would like us to look at, such as national roads and national forests. We encourage timber harvests and then cover the costs of the building of roads that do not necessarily have to be built and that cost the taxpayer a great deal of money. We have enormous agricultural support subsidies to any number of industries. In fact, there will be a number of programs in the next appropriations bill that we will consider, the agriculture bill, that we ought to look at, entitlement programs. But I do not think a 1 percent across-the-board cut to the workforce in the legislative branch is warranted at this time. I urge Members to reject the amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of any two gentleman that I hate being on the opposite side of more than these two gentlemen, because they are so conscientious.

Let me say that I think there are ways that we can get at this 1 percent without doing all the damage that has

been suggested. For instance, I have not used frank mailing in years. Maybe we do not need as big a frank mailing budget. I have never had my full complement of staff that they allow us to have. Maybe we do not need as many staff as they say we can have.

There are things like that that I think we could do to bring this budget down. I give several hundred thousand dollars each year back into the pot that I simply do not spend, because that is a budget that I can control. So if I mean what I say about balancing the budget, I feel I ought to try to control it. That has amounted to many millions of dollars over the time I have been here. So there are ways.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage an aye vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT); and Amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY HOLT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 252, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

AYES—115

Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Beccerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)

Boswell
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Case
Chandler
Clay

Clyburn
Cooper
Crowley
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Etheridge
Evans
Filner
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind

Klecza
Kucinich
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lynch
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mollohan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oliver
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rodriguez

Rothman
Royal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—252

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baird
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English

Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseeth
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klaine
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)

Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Matsui
McCotter
McCreery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender
Gingrey
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Turner (TX)	Davis (TN)	Herger	Petri	Sánchez, Linda	Spratt	Van Hollen
Ross	Smith (TX)	Upton	Davis, Jo Ann	Hooley (OR)	Pitts	T.	Strickland	Velázquez
Royce	Souder	Van Hollen	Hulshof	Hulshof	Ramstad	Sanchez, Loretta	Stupak	Visclosky
Ryan (WI)	Stenholm	Visclosky	DeFazio	Jenkins	Rohrabacher	Sandlin	Sullivan	Walden (OR)
Ryun (KS)	Sullivan	Walden (OR)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)	Royce	Saxton	Sweeney	Walsh
Saxton	Sweeney	Walsh	Doggett	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)	Schakowsky	Tauscher	Waters
Schrock	Tancredo	Wamp	Duncan	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)	Schiff	Tauzin	Watson
Scott (GA)	Tanner	Waters	Edwards	Lampson	Schrock	Scott (GA)	Taylor (NC)	Watt
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Weldon (FL)	Everett	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner	Serrano	Terry	Weiner
Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (PA)	Flake	LoBiondo	Sessions	Shaw	Thomas	Weldon (FL)
Sessions	Taylor (NC)	Weller	Forbes	Marshall	Sherman	Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (PA)
Shadegg	Terry	Wicker	Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Sherwood	Sherwood	Thompson (MS)	Weller
Shaw	Thomas	Wilson (NM)	Gibbons	McInnis	Shimkus	Simmons	Thornberry	Wicker
Sherwood	Thompson (CA)	Wolf	Goode	Mica	Smith (MI)	Simpson	Tiberi	Wilson (NM)
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wynn	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)	Skelton	Towns	Wolf
Simmons	Tiberi	Young (AK)	Graves	Moran (KS)	Souder	Slaughter	Turner (OH)	Woolsey
Simpson	Towns	Young (FL)	Green (TX)	Musgrave	Stearns	Smith (NJ)	Turner (TX)	Wu
Smith (MI)	Turner (OH)		Green (WI)	Myrick	Stenholm	Smith (TX)	Udall (CO)	Wynn
			Hall	Neugebauer	Tancredo	Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)	Young (AK)
			Hayes	Norwood	Tanner	Solis	Upton	Young (FL)
			Hayworth	Otter	Taylor (MS)			
			Hefley	Paul	Wamp			
			Hensarling	Pence				

NOT VOTING—66

Andrews	Feeney	Menendez
Bachus	Fossella	Miller, George
Baker	Frank (MA)	Moore
Bass	Garrett (NJ)	Owens
Bell	Gephardt	Pascrell
Bishop (UT)	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Quinn
Burr	Gutknecht	Sabo
Burton (IN)	Hinchee	Sanders
Capuano	Hinojosa	Scott (VA)
Carson (IN)	Hoeffel	Shays
Carson (OK)	Hostettler	Shuster
Collins	Houghton	Skelton
Conyers	Isakson	Stark
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Tiahrt
DeLauro	Keller	Tierney
DeMint	Lee	Toomey
Deutsch	Lipinski	Vitter
Dicks	Majette	Waxman
Dooley (CA)	Maloney	Wexler
Engel	Markey	Whitfield
Fattah	Meehan	Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1916

Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MOLLOHAN and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 278, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—87

Akin	Bradley (NH)	Chabot
Barrett (SC)	Brady (TX)	Chocola
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Cooper
Beauprez	Burgess	Cox
Bilirakis	Buyer	Crane
Blackburn	Cannon	Cubin

Abercrombie	Filner
Ackerman	Foley
Aderholt	Ford
Alexander	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Frost
Baca	Gallegly
Baird	Gerlach
Baldwin	Gilchrest
Ballegger	Gillmor
Becerra	Gingrey
Bereuter	Gonzalez
Berkley	Gordon
Granger	Greenwood
Berry	Grijalva
Biggert	Harman
Bishop (GA)	Harris
Bishop (NY)	Hart
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)
Blunt	Hastings (WA)
Boehlert	Herseth
Boehner	Hill
Bonilla	Hobson
Bonner	Hoekstra
Bono	Holden
Boozman	Holt
Boswell	Honda
Boucher	Hoyer
Boyd	Hunter
Brady (PA)	Hyde
Brown (OH)	Inslee
Brown (SC)	Israel
Burns	Issa
Calvert	Istook
Camp	Jackson (IL)
Cantor	Jackson (TX)
Capito	Jefferson
Capps	John
Cardin	Johnson (CT)
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)
Carter	Johnson, Sam
Case	Jones (OH)
Castle	Kanjorski
Chandler	Kaptur
Clay	Kelly
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)
Cole	Kildee
Costello	Kilpatrick
Cramer	Kind
Crenshaw	Kingston
Crowley	Kirk
Culberson	Kleczka
Cummings	Kline
Cunningham	Knollenberg
Davis (AL)	Kolbe
Davis (CA)	Kucinich
Davis (FL)	LaHood
Davis (IL)	Langevin
DeGette	Lantos
DeLay	Larsen (WA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Larson (CT)
Dingell	Latham
Doolittle	LaTourette
Doyle	Leach
Dreier	Levin
Dunn	Lewis (CA)
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)
Emanuel	Linder
Emerson	Lofgren
English	Lowey
Eshoo	Lucas (KY)
Etheridge	Lucas (OK)
Evans	Lynch
Farr	
Ferguson	

NOES—278

Manzullo	McCarthy (MO)
Matheson	McCarthy (NY)
Matsui	McCollum
McCrery	McDermott
McDermott	McGovern
McGovern	McHugh
McHugh	McIntyre
McIntyre	McKeon
McKeon	McNulty
McNulty	Meek (FL)
Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Meeks (NY)	Michaud
Michaud	Millender-
Millender-	McDonald
McDonald	Miller (MI)
Miller (MI)	Miller (NC)
Miller (NC)	Miller, Gary
Miller, Gary	Mollohan
Mollohan	Moran (VA)
Moran (VA)	Murphy
Murphy	Murtha
Murtha	Nadler
Nadler	Napolitano
Napolitano	Neal (MA)
Neal (MA)	Nethercutt
Nethercutt	Ney
Ney	Northup
Northup	Nunes
Nunes	Nussle
Nussle	Oberstar
Oberstar	Obey
Obey	Oliver
Oliver	Ortiz
Ortiz	Osborne
Osborne	Ose
Ose	Pallone
Pallone	Pastor
Pastor	Payne
Payne	Pearce
Pearce	Pelosi
Pelosi	Peterson (MN)
Peterson (MN)	Pickering
Pickering	Platts
Platts	Pombo
Pombo	Pomeroy
Pomeroy	Porter
Porter	Portman
Portman	Price (NC)
Price (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Pryce (OH)	Putnam
Putnam	Radanovich
Radanovich	Rahall
Rahall	Rangel
Rangel	Regula
Regula	Rehberg
Rehberg	Renzi
Renzi	Reyes
Reyes	Reynolds
Reynolds	Rodriguez
Rodriguez	Rogers (AL)
Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)
Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)
Rogers (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Ros-Lehtinen	Ross
Ross	Rothman
Rothman	Roybal-Allard
Roybal-Allard	Rubensberger
Rubensberger	Rush
Rush	Ryan (OH)

NOT VOTING—68

Andrews	Feeney	Menendez
Bachus	Fossella	Miller, George
Baker	Frank (MA)	Moore
Bass	Garrett (NJ)	Owens
Bell	Gephardt	Oxley
Bishop (UT)	Goss	Pascrell
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Peterson (PA)
Burr	Gutknecht	Quinn
Burton (IN)	Hinchee	Sabo
Capuano	Hinojosa	Sanders
Carson (IN)	Hoeffel	Scott (VA)
Carson (OK)	Hostettler	Shays
Collins	Houghton	Shuster
Conyers	Isakson	Stark
Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Tiahrt
Delahunt	Keller	Tierney
DeLauro	King (NY)	Toomey
DeMint	Lee	Vitter
Deutsch	Lipinski	Waxman
Dicks	Majette	Wexler
Dooley (CA)	Maloney	Whitfield
Engel	Markey	Wilson (SC)
Fattah	Meehan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1925

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, owing to weather-caused flight delays, I was regrettably absent on Monday, July 12, 2004, and consequently missed recorded votes numbered 359 and 360. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” and “aye” respectively on these votes.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4755) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 707, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the 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. SHERMAN

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4755, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill promptly with an amendment prohibiting the use of funds for postage expenses of any single committee in an aggregate amount exceeding \$25,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, under this motion, the bill would be amended so that we would have a \$25,000 limit on the amount that any single committee would spend on postage during fiscal 2005.

Before I discuss why such a limit is necessary, I will enter two letters into the RECORD.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
July 12, 2004.

Hon. BRAD SHERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHERMAN: On behalf of the 350,000-member National Taxpayers Union (NTU), I am responding to your request for NTU's views on a proposal to limit each Committee's expenditure on postage to the sum of no more than \$25,000 per year.

Even as overall postage and printing expenditures have declined from the \$100 million-plus levels once seen in Congresses 15 years ago, franking remains a source of fiscal and political interest to NTU. The already-generous limits governing the use of postage by House Members' personal offices were lifted in 1999, while new computer technologies have allowed lawmakers to maximize the impact of their mailings in ways that were not feasible as recently as ten years ago. Today, it is still possible for an incumbent House Member to spend as much on franking in a year as a challenger spends on his or her entire campaign. Rules regarding the content and proximity of mailings to elections only modestly offset this tremendous political advantage.

During our 15-year campaign on behalf of franking reform, NTU has focused on Member offices because they are the primary source of unsolicited mass mailings and associated expenditures. We were thus surprised to learn of a single Committee's FY 2005 postage request for \$250,000 in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill.

NTU is greatly concerned over the prospect of any Committee in Congress receiving postage funding in these amounts, as it would mark a significant expansion of the franking privilege that had traditionally been utilized in large part by Member offices. Such concern is irrespective of the immediate policy issue at hand or the parties involved. If the House sets a budget precedent now, taxpayers will very shortly face the unwelcome prospect of tens of millions in addition franking expenditures in future Congresses. Equally important, Americans would be forced to contend with a new set of issues affecting the balance of the political process.

Years of efforts from groups like NTU and reformers within Congress have yielded an improved, yet imperfect, franking disclosure process. Despite instances of poor record-keeping, inadequate disclosure, and overly-permissive rules, today constituents at least have limited access to basic franking information—giving them a chance to hold House Members politically accountable for the unsolicited mass mailings they send into their districts at taxpayer expense. Allowing such a practice at the Committee level, where ties between Members and constituents are less direct, would undermine even this limited progress.

It is especially galling that Congress would even consider an additional taxpayer-financed expansion of the franking privilege under the current fiscal and political circumstances. Amidst FY 2005 budget deficit estimates approaching \$400 billion, and a campaign finance law that further hampers political challengers, allowing such a huge postage funding request for any Committee will further reinforce Congress's reputation as an institution incapable of self-restraint.

Given the historic patterns of Committee expenditures, a \$25,000 annual limit on postage for each Committee is more than adequate for any legitimate communication needs. Seemingly minor budget requests such as the one before Congress now can have major consequences for taxpayers in the not-too-distant future. For this reason alone, the House of Representatives can and should restrict Committee postage expenditures—and a \$25,000 annual limit is a reasonable first step.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any additional questions regarding our position.

Sincerely,

PETE SEPP,
Vice President for Communications.

COUNCIL FOR
CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
July 12, 2004.

Representative Brad Sherman,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SHERMAN: The more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste would like to express their appreciation for your cost-saving effort to limit each Committee to spending \$25,000 a year on postage.

Sincerely,

THOMAS SCHATZ,
President.

I will quote them in part. The first is from the National Taxpayers Union, and it states in part, "The House of Representatives can and should restrict committee postage expenditures, and a \$25,000 limit is a reasonable first step."

The second states, on behalf of the 1 million members of Citizens Against Government Waste, that they would like to express their appreciation to me for my cost-saving efforts to limit each committee to spending \$25,000 and no more per year on postage.

This is the first time that any of my legislative proposals have been endorsed by both the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that does not count against my time, but it is so nice to be applauded by my colleagues on that side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, in the history of this House, as far as I can determine, no committee up until the 108th Congress ever found it necessary to even spend \$10,000 on postage.

In the 107th Congress, the committee that spent the most on postage spent an average of \$7,000 a year during the 2 years of the 107th Congress.

In the 108th Congress, a new philosophy was born. That philosophy caused one authorizing committee to seek \$500,000 just for postage just for the 108th Congress. That was \$250,000 a year. That request represented a 4,445 percent increase over what that committee had requested for the 107th Congress. The Committee on House Administration allowed that committee only \$50,000 a year, only \$100,000 for postage.

□ 1930

But we are not talking about prior fiscal years. If we do not change this bill, committees will be asking for half a million dollars a year again, and in a few years it will be commonplace for individual committee Chairs to have half a million, a million, several million dollars of postage. And an equal amount for printing in political slush fund that they can use to mail into Members' districts, hit pieces or praise pieces. It is just around the corner. And we will hear from the gentleman or gentlewoman who rises against this motion that maybe it is a good thing and maybe this House should determine that it is a good thing that each committee Chair controls millions of dollars and sends out mail, perhaps justified by field hearing programs, without a field hearing, but either way with attacks or praise for individual Members mailing into their districts.

Now, this one committee on just one day in December spent \$49,587 on postage and another \$40,732 printing up the material that was to be mailed.

Now, when I say this bill is about the future and people on this side of the aisle need to hear this, this motion affects the 2005 fiscal year. It restricts Chairs; and when I talk about 2005, I mean Democratic Chairs, or perhaps Republican. Either way it is important that the Chairs of either party not be tempted to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars punishing or rewarding individual members of their committee. This is especially important because the House rules are not clear, and it is possible that you can send out committee mailings right until election day.

Now, how is this different than Member mailings? Mr. Speaker, when a Member mails to his or her own district, the recipients of that mail can punish the Member if they think that sending that mail is a waste of government resources. When a Chair mails into some district that is not his or her own, there are not ways to hold that Chair accountable.

This is the one chance we have in this House to vote to draw the line. We can think of some perfect world where

we have an authorizing bill where we can vote. We will not have this chance. Do not fool yourselves. You can open Pandora's box by defeating this. You can open Pandora's box to a day when committee Chairs have hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars to spend on postage attacking individual Members, or you can vote for this motion and draw the line now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Does the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) oppose the motion?

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I could take the entire 2½ minutes allotted to me to try to correct all of the facts that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) just put out over the last week or so here. Unfortunately, 2½ minutes is not enough time to do that, so I would like to get to the substance of what his amendment is trying to do.

Earlier in the debate, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) said that this was a new day in politics for committees to begin to frank. And committees have franked before, but I hope it is a new day. I hope it is a new era that we are entering into because when I took over as chairman of the Committee on Resources, one of the things that I did commit to was getting Members of Congress outside the Beltway, out across the country to listen to people that are affected by the laws that we pass in this House.

As a result of that, we have held 41 field hearings on the Committee on Resources. And members of my committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, have gone all over this country from Maryland to California, from Florida to Washington to listen to the people that were impacted by the issues that are under our committee. And, yes, we have franked.

We have gone into areas and said we are holding the field hearing in this region and we have told people that we are coming and we are going to be there. Now, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) said earlier in the debate that if it was an interesting enough hearing that the press should be able to cover that and we should not have to frank. And I found that quite interesting coming from him, seeing that last year he sent out 12 notices telling people he was having town hall meetings in his district. So if they were interesting enough, you would not have had to do that.

Well, quite frankly, sometimes it is in the best interest of good government to tell people that you are having a field hearing and you are going out there.

One of the things that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has in-

timated over and over and over in this debate over the last week was that this was partisan. We sent out pieces in the Democrat districts, in the Republican districts. Everything we sent out had all of the names of the members of the Committee on Resources on it. It was done in a bipartisan fashion.

One of the things that we have tried to do on this committee is to work in a bipartisan fashion. And with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and myself, we have accomplished that over the last 2 years. And to have you come in and try to do this, I think, is absolutely ridiculous. This is something we should be doing. Vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear, first of all, because we have heard the half a million dollar figure bandied about a couple times now. The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) never asked me for half a million dollars.

Now, I can produce today about nine to 10 different sheets that we have had over the last 4 years in House administration of people asking for all types of money, minority and majority. So the half a million dollar figure is absolutely erroneous. And to actually stand here today and think that House Administration would be able to produce a half a million per committee in the future is also ridiculous. And I also think the gentleman does not want to start to talk about the history of spending in House Administration in this House, especially in the last 9 years when we, in fact, have pared down hundreds and hundreds of staff and cut one-third of the size of this House, in fact.

So I do not think you want to get into today the spending history. But let me make it clear. The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) followed the rules to the T. This was bipartisan. This was mailed out for Democrats. This was mailed out for Republicans.

Another statement today that is incorrect, I am sure the gentleman did it in error, is about the fact of limits. Members in this House are unlimited in how much they would spend. Your 70-some mailers in the last 2 years, you are unlimited, and that is your choice; and I do not today disparage you for mailing those. That is a Member's choice.

As far as the committee affects the entire United States, they have every right, every right to communicate in today's society. These were bipartisan. This was bipartisanly approved by House Administration. The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) followed this to the T. But I can assure you, House Administration has been responsible with the last ranking member to the current ranking member, and I am sure it is going to be responsible in the future. There is absolutely no way there is going to be millions of dollars

of accounts. That is a type of fear spreading that simply will not occur. But I will close.

I respect the gentleman's tenacity. And also, it was a pleasure to be here in the pinnacle of your year when you got the National Taxpayers Union because I am sure it is the last time I will see it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was 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 the question of passage and the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 205, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—163

Ackerman	Hefley	Miller (NC)
Alexander	Herseth	Mollohan
Allen	Hill	Moore
Baird	Holden	Moran (VA)
Baldwin	Holt	Murtha
Becerra	Honda	Nadler
Berkley	Hoolley (OR)	Napolitano
Berman	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Berry	Inslee	Oberstar
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Obey
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Boswell	(TX)	Paul
Boucher	Jefferson	Payne
Boyd	John	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Capps	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Chandler	Kildee	Reyes
Clay	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Kind	Ross
Coble	Kleczka	Rothman
Cooper	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Lampson	Ruppersberger
Cramer	Langevin	Rush
Crowley	Lantos	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Davis (TN)	Lofgren	Schiff
DeFazio	Lowey	Scott (GA)
DeGette	Lucas (KY)	Serrano
Doggett	Lynch	Sherman
Doyle	Marshall	Skelton
Edwards	Matheson	Slaughter
Emanuel	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Solis
Evans	McCollum	Spratt
Farr	McDermott	Stenholm
Filner	McGovern	Strickland
Ford	McIntyre	Stupak
Frost	McNulty	Tanner
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	Tauscher
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Green (TX)	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Grijalva	Millender-	Thompson (MS)
Hastings (FL)	McDonald	Towns

Turner (TX) Visclosky Woolsey
 Udall (CO) Waters Wu
 Udall (NM) Watson Wynn
 Van Hollen Watt
 Velázquez Weiner

Vitter Wexler Wilson (SC)
 Waxman Whitfield Young (FL)

Myrick Rodriguez Sullivan
 Nadler Rogers (AL) Sweeney
 Napolitano Rogers (KY) Tancredo
 Neal (MA) Rogers (MI) Tanner
 Nethercutt Rohrabacher Tauscher
 Ney Ros-Lehtinen Tauzin
 Northup Ross Taylor (NC)
 Norwood Nunes Terry
 Nunes Roybal-Allard Thomas
 Ruppertsberger Ruppertsberger
 Oberstar Rush Thompson (CA)
 Olver Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)
 Ortiz Ryan (WI) Thornberry
 Osborne Ryun (KS) Tiberi
 Ose Sánchez, Linda Towns
 Pallone T. Turner (OH)
 Pastor Sanchez, Loretta Turner (TX)
 Payne Sandlin Udall (CO)
 Pearce Saxton Udall (NM)
 Pelosi Schakowsky Upton
 Pence Schiff Van Hollen
 Peterson (MN) Schrock Velázquez
 Pickering Scott (GA) Visclosky
 Pitts Scott (VA) Walden (OR)
 Platts Serrano Walsh
 Pombo Sessions Wamp
 Pomeroy Shadegg Waters
 Porter Shaw Watson
 Portman Sherwood Weiner
 Price (NC) Shimkus Weldon (FL)
 Pryce (OH) Simmons Weldon (PA)
 Putnam Simpson Weller
 Radanovich Skelton Wicker
 Rahall Smith (NJ) Wilson (NM)
 Ramstad Smith (TX) Wolf
 Rangel Smith (WA) Woolsey
 Regula Snyder Young (AK)
 Rehberg Solis Young (FL)
 Renzi Spratt
 Reyes Stenholm
 Reynolds Strickland

NOES—205

Abercrombie Gerlach Nussle
 Aderholt Gibbons Ortiz
 Akin Gilchrest Osborne
 Baca Gillmor Ose
 Ballenger Gingrey Otter
 Barrett (SC) Goode Pastor
 Bartlett (MD) Goodlatte Pearce
 Barton (TX) Granger Pence
 Bass Graves Petri
 Beauprez Green (WI) Pickering
 Bereuter Greenwood Pitts
 Biggert Hall Platts
 Bilirakis Harris Pombo
 Blackburn Hart Porter
 Blunt Hastings (WA) Portman
 Boehlert Hayes Pryce (OH)
 Boehner Hayworth Putnam
 Bonilla Hensarling Radanovich
 Bonner Herger Rahall
 Bono Hobson Ramstad
 Boozman Hoekstra Regula
 Bradley (NH) Hulshof Rehberg
 Brady (TX) Hunter Renzi
 Brown (SC) Hyde Reynolds
 Brown-Waite, Issa Rogers (AL)
 Ginny Istook Rogers (KY)
 Burgess Jenkins Rogers (MI)
 Burns Johnson (CT) Rohrabacher
 Buyer Johnson (IL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Calvert Johnson, Sam Royce
 Camp Jones (NC) Ryan (WI)
 Cannon Keller Ryun (KS)
 Cantor Kelly Saxton
 Capito Kennedy (MN) Schrock
 Cardoza King (IA) Sensenbrenner
 Carter Kingston Sessions
 Case Kirk Shadegg
 Castle Kline Shaw
 Chabot Knollenberg Sherwood
 Chocola Kolbe Shimkus
 Cole LaHood Simmons
 Cox Latham Simpson
 Crane LaTourette Smith (MI)
 Crenshaw Leach Smith (NJ)
 Cubin Lewis (CA) Smith (TX)
 Culberson Lewis (KY) Souder
 Cunningham Linder Stearns
 Davis, Jo Ann LoBiondo Sullivan
 Deal (GA) Lucas (OK) Sweeney
 DeLay Manzullo Tancredo
 Diaz-Balart, L. McCotter Tauszin
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCrery Taylor (NC)
 Dingell McHugh Terry
 Doolittle McInnis Thomas
 Dreier McKeon Thornberry
 Duncan Mica Tiberi
 Dunn Miller (FL) Turner (OH)
 Ehlers Miller (MI) Upton
 Emerson Miller, Gary Walden (OR)
 English Moran (KS) Walsh
 Everett Murphy Wamp
 Feeney Musgrave Weldon (FL)
 Ferguson Myrick Weldon (PA)
 Flake Nethercutt Weller
 Foley Neugebauer Wicker
 Forbes Ney Wilson (NM)
 Franks (AZ) Northup Wolf
 Frelinghuysen Norwood Young (AK)
 Gallegly Nunes

NOT VOTING—65

Andrews Engel Maloney
 Bachus Fattah Markey
 Baker Fossella Meehan
 Bell Frank (MA) Menendez
 Bishop (UT) Garrett (NJ) Miller, George
 Brown, Corrine Gephardt Owens
 Burr Goss Oxley
 Burton (IN) Gutierrez Pascrell
 Capuano Gutknecht Peterson (PA)
 Carson (IN) Harman Quinn
 Carson (OK) Hinchey Sabo
 Collins Hinojosa Sanders
 Conyers Hoeffel Scott (VA)
 Davis, Tom Hostettler Shays
 Delahunt Houghton Shuster
 DeLauro Isakson Stark
 DeMint Johnson, E. B. Tiahrt
 Deutsch King (NY) Tierney
 Dicks Lee Toomey
 Dooley (CA) Majette

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1959

So the motion 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.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 43, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

YEAS—327

Abercrombie Cunningham Jackson-Lee
 Ackerman Davis (AL) (TX)
 Aderholt Davis (CA) Jefferson
 Akin Davis (FL) Jenkins
 Alexander Davis (IL) John
 Allen Davis (TN) Johnson (CT)
 Baca Deal (GA) Johnson (IL)
 Baird DeFazio Johnson, Sam
 Baldwin DeGette Jones (OH)
 Ballenger DeLay Kanjorski
 Barrett (SC) Diaz-Balart, L. Kaptur
 Barton (TX) Diaz-Balart, M. Keller
 Bass Dingell Kelly
 Beauprez Doolittle Kennedy (RI)
 Becerra Doyle Kilpatrick
 Bereuter Dreier King (IA)
 Berkley Dunn Kingston
 Berman Edwards Kirk
 Biggert Ehlers Kleczka
 Bilirakis Emanuel Kline
 Bishop (GA) Emerson Knollenberg
 Bishop (NY) English Kolbe
 Blackburn Eshoo Kuemich
 Blumenauer Etheridge LaHood
 Blunt Evans Lampson
 Boehlert Everett Langevin
 Bono Farr Lantos
 Bonilla Feeney Larsen (WA)
 Bonner Ferguson Larson (CT)
 Bono Filner Latham
 Boozman Foley LaTourette
 Boswell Ford Leach
 Boucher Frelinghuysen Levin
 Boyd Frost Lewis (GA)
 Bradley (NH) Gallegly Lewis (KY)
 Brady (PA) Gerlach Linder
 Brady (TX) Gibbons Lipinski
 Brown (OH) Gilchrest Lowey
 Brown (SC) Gillmor Lucas (KY)
 Brown-Waite, Gonzalez Lucas (OK)
 Ginny Goodlatte Lynch
 Burgess Goodlatte Manzullo
 Burns Gordon Marshall
 Buyer Granger Matsui
 Calvert Greenwood McCarthy (MO)
 Camp Grijalva McCarthy (NY)
 Cannon Hall McCotter
 Cantor Harman McDermott
 Capito Harris McGovern
 Capps Hart McHugh
 Cardin Hastings (FL) McInnis
 Cardoza Hastings (WA) McIntyre
 Carter Hayes McKean
 Case Herger McNulty
 Castle Herseth Meek (FL)
 Chabot Hill Meeks (NY)
 Chandler Hobson Mica
 Chocola Hoekstra Michaud
 Clay Holden Millender-
 Clyburn Holt McDonald
 Cole Honda Miller (MI)
 Cooper Hooley (OR) Miller (NC)
 Cox Hoyer Miller, Gary
 Cramer Hunter Mollohan
 Crane Hyde Moran (KS)
 Crenshaw Insee Moran (VA)
 Crowley Israel Murphy
 Cubin Issa Murtha
 Culberson Istook Musgrave
 Cummings Jackson (IL)

Sanchez, Loretta
 Sandlin
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrock
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Spratt
 Stenholm
 Strickland

NAYS—43

Bartlett (MD) Hefley Otter
 Berry Hensarling Paul
 Coble Hulshof Petri
 Costello Jones (NC) Royce
 Davis, Jo Ann Kennedy (MN) Sensenbrenner
 Doggett Kildee Sherman
 Duncan Kind Slaughter
 Flake LoBiondo Smith (MI)
 Forbes Lofgren Souder
 Franks (AZ) Matheson Stearns
 Goode McCollum Stupak
 Graves Miller (FL) Taylor (MS)
 Green (TX) Moore Wu
 Green (WI) Neugebauer
 Hayworth Obey

NOT VOTING—63

Andrews Fattah Meehan
 Bachus Fossella Menendez
 Baker Frank (MA) Miller, George
 Bell Garrett (NJ) Owens
 Bishop (UT) Gephardt Oxley
 Brown, Corrine Goss Pascrell
 Burr Gutierrez Peterson (PA)
 Burton (IN) Gutknecht Quinn
 Capuano Hinchey Sabo
 Carson (IN) Hinojosa Sanders
 Carson (OK) Hoeffel Shays
 Collins Hostettler Shuster
 Conyers Houghton Stark
 Davis, Tom Isakson Tiahrt
 Delahunt Johnson, E. B. Tierney
 DeLauro King (NY) Toomey
 DeMint Lee Vitter
 Deutsch Lewis (CA) Waxman
 Dicks Majette Wexler
 Dooley (CA) Maloney Whitfield
 Engel Markey Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2005

Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather in Indiana, I was regrettably delayed in my return to Washington, DC and therefore unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 359, 360, 361 and 362. Had I been here I would have voted "no" for rollcall vote 359, "aye" for rollcall vote 360, "no" for rollcall vote 361, and "aye" for rollcall vote 362.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I missed four votes in the House of Representatives on July 12, 2004. Had I been in attendance I would have made the following votes:

Vote on the Holt amendment to H.R. 4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have vote "aye."

Vote on the Hefley amendment to H.R. 4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "no."

Vote on the Motion to Recommit—4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have vote "aye."

Vote on passage of H.R. 4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have vote "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2004, I was unable to be present for the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall 348, to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 349, on the motion to adjourn, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 350, on ordering the previous question, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 351, on agreeing to House Resolution 711, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 352, on tabling the motion to reconsider, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 353, on the motion to adjourn, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 354, on the motion to recommit with instructions, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 355, on agreeing to the Gordon amendment, I would have voted yea;

On rollcall 356, on agreeing to the Jackson-Lee amendment, I would have voted yea;

On rollcall 357, on agreeing to the Larson amendment, I would have voted yea;

On rollcall 358, on the motion to recommit with instructions, I would have voted yea.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4766.

The Chair designates the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) assume the chair temporarily.

□ 2006

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to present the agriculture appropriation bill to the full House tonight. It is a bill that we are proud of. It is a product of a bipartisan effort that we have had on our subcommittee and our full committee. The subcommittee that produces this bill has a history of working in a bipartisan way and always trying to include the input of every member of the subcommittee on an annual basis.

This is a subcommittee that had to entertain over 2,100 individual requests for items to be included in this bill, and we did the best we could. This year, we had an unusual constraint, and that is a tighter budget, a more fiscally responsible budget that has forced us to appropriately present a bill that is \$67 million less than it was last year. And I might point out that the bill we did last year was below the previous year as well.

So fiscal conservatives should be proud of this product as well, and those who support agriculture issues in this country should be proud. Agriculture research, Food and Drug Administration, there are so many parts to this bill that affect so many people in this country. This bill, of course, also funds the Food Stamp program, the Women, Infants and Children program, we fund Food Safety, and the list goes on and on.

We have a very good subcommittee, and I mention them on a regular basis, but I would like to take the opportunity tonight to mention some of the people behind the scenes that do the grunt work day in and day out, oftentimes when Members of Congress are back in their congressional districts meeting with constituents and spending time with family. They are the ones back here going through every line item and looking for every opportunity to make this bill a good bill, which is what we are presenting here this evening.

Martha Foley, of the minority staff, is someone we work with in good faith, and she does a great job for us every day; Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, and Joanne Perdue of the majority staff. We also had two detailees helping us this year, Tom O'Brien and Mike Gregoire. And then, of course, I would like to single out the clerk, Martin Delgado, who is clerking for the first time for this subcommittee and doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee began work on this bill with the submission of the President's Budget on February 2nd. We had ten public hearings beginning on February 25th, and we completed our hearings on March 25th. The transcripts of these hearings, the Administration's official statements, the detailed budget requests, several thousand questions for the record, and the statements of Members and the public are contained in eight hearing volumes that are all printed.

The Subcommittee and Full Committee marked up the bill on June 14th and June 23rd, respectively. I can confirm to you that the interest in this bill is completely bipartisan. However, I would point out that my own support for a member's needs independent on that member's support of the Committee in general, and of this bill in particular.

Mr. Chairman, you may hear a lot of talk today about funding items that are not in this bill, or accounts that may be a little short, but I can assure you and the members of this body that given the allocation we had, that this is a fair, and fiscally-responsible bill.

This bill has increases over fiscal year 2004 in some cases, or over the budget request in

others, for programs that have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support. Those increases include:

Agricultural Research Service, \$69 million above the request;

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, \$92 million above last year, but \$20 million below the request;

Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$45 million above last year;

Farm Service Agency, \$25 million above last year;

Natural Resources Conservation Service, \$34 million below last year, but \$84 million above the request;

Rural Community Advancement Program, \$86 million below last year, but \$125 million above the request;

For the Women, Infants, and Children program the bill is \$295 million above last year, and \$120 million above the request;

Food and Drug Administration, \$84 million over last year, and \$32 million below the request.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we refer to this bill as the agriculture bill, but it goes farther than assisting basic agriculture. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, agricultural exports, land conservation, as well as food, drug, and medical safety. This bill will deliver benefits to every one of your constituents every day, no matter what kind of district you represent.

I would say to all Members that they can support this bill and tell all of their constituents that they voted to improve their lives while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

The bill is a bipartisan product with a lot of hard work and input from both sides of the aisle. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who serve as the distinguished chairman and ranking member

of the Committee on Appropriations. I would also like to thank all my subcommittee colleagues: the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM); the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON); the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD); the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO); the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY); the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR); and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for all her good work on this bill this year and the years in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting for the RECORD at this point tabular material relating to the bill.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs Reques
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary.....	5,062	5,185	5,185	+123	---
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist.....	8,656	14,949	10,810	+2,154	-4,139
National Appeals Division.....	13,589	14,826	14,526	+937	-300
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	7,694	8,146	8,246	+552	+100
Homeland Security staff.....	496	1,491	508	+12	-983
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	15,402	22,093	15,608	+206	-6,485
Common computing environment.....	118,585	136,736	120,957	+2,372	-15,779
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	5,650	8,063	5,811	+161	-2,252
Working capital fund.....	---	12,850	12,850	+12,850	---
Total, Executive Operations.....	170,072	219,154	189,316	+19,244	-29,838
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights....	803	819	803	---	-16
Office of Civil Rights.....	18,123	22,283	19,452	+1,329	-2,831
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration..	669	808	669	---	-139
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental					
payments.....	(155,546)	(203,938)	(165,883)	(+10,337)	(-38,055)
Payments to GSA.....	123,179	128,319	128,319	+5,140	---
Building operations and maintenance.....	32,367	41,642	35,564	+3,197	-6,078
Repairs, renovations, and construction.....	---	33,977	2,000	+2,000	-31,977
Hazardous materials management.....	15,519	15,730	15,730	+211	---
Departmental administration.....	22,119	26,361	22,939	+820	-3,422
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional					
Relations.....	3,774	4,263	3,852	+78	-411
Office of Communications.....	9,174	10,288	9,378	+204	-910
Office of the Inspector General.....	76,825	78,392	78,392	+1,567	---
Office of the General Counsel.....	34,495	38,589	35,486	+991	-3,103
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education,					
and Economics.....	592	805	592	---	-213
Economic Research Service.....	70,981	80,032	76,575	+5,594	-3,457
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	128,161	137,594	128,661	+500	-8,933
Census of Agriculture.....	(25,279)	(22,520)	(22,520)	(-2,759)	---
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,082,468	987,597	1,057,029	-25,439	+69,432
Buildings and facilities.....	63,434	178,000	202,000	+138,566	+24,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	1,145,902	1,165,597	1,259,029	+113,127	+93,432
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension					
Service:					
Research and education activities.....	617,780	501,540	628,607	+10,827	+127,067
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(9,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(+3,000)	---
Extension activities.....	439,125	421,174	440,349	+1,224	+19,175
Integrated activities.....	50,195	76,865	66,255	+16,060	-10,610
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	5,935	5,935	5,935	---	---
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education,	1,113,035	1,005,514	1,141,146	+28,111	+135,632
and Extension Service.....					
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and					
Regulatory Programs.....	721	804	721	---	-83
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	716,329	828,361	808,823	+92,494	-19,538
Buildings and facilities.....	4,967	4,996	4,996	+29	---
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection	721,296	833,357	813,819	+92,523	-19,538
Service.....					

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services.....	74,985	85,998	75,892	+907	-10,106
Standardization user fees.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(62,577)	(64,459)	(64,459)	(+1,882)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32).....	15,392	15,800	15,800	+408	---
Payments to states and possessions.....	3,318	1,347	1,347	-1,971	---
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	93,695	103,145	93,039	-656	-10,106
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses.....	35,678	44,150	37,540	+1,862	-6,610
Limitation on inspection and weighing services....	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	595	803	595	---	-208
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	779,882	838,660	824,746	+44,864	-13,914
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing....	4,602,719	4,836,271	4,923,548	+320,829	+87,277
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	631	933	631	---	-302
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....	982,934	1,007,877	1,007,597	+24,663	-280
(Transfer from export loans).....	(841)	(1,033)	(1,033)	(+192)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,053)	(3,119)	(1,269)	(+216)	(-1,850)
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(281,350)	(305,011)	(289,445)	(+8,095)	(-15,566)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts.....	(283,244)	(309,163)	(291,747)	(+8,503)	(-17,416)
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,266,178)	(1,317,040)	(1,299,344)	(+33,166)	(-17,696)
State mediation grants.....	3,951	4,000	4,000	+49	---
Dairy indemnity program.....	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	986,985	1,011,977	1,011,697	+24,712	-280
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(128,396)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(+71,604)	---
Guaranteed.....	(944,395)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(+455,605)	---
Subtotal.....	(1,072,791)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(+527,209)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(613,860)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(+36,140)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,192,920)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(+7,080)	---
Subsidized guaranteed.....	(264,678)	(266,253)	(266,253)	(+1,575)	---
Subtotal.....	(2,071,458)	(2,116,253)	(2,116,253)	(+44,795)	---
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	---	---
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.....	---	(25,000)	---	---	(-25,000)
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(100,000)	(60,000)	(100,000)	---	(+40,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,246,249)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,253)	(+572,004)	(+15,000)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	28,350	10,700	10,700	-17,650	---
Guaranteed.....	5,100	7,420	7,420	+2,320	---
Subtotal.....	33,450	18,120	18,120	-15,330	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	88,519	65,585	65,585	-22,934	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	39,724	38,760	38,760	-964	---
Subsidized guaranteed.....	33,799	35,438	35,438	+1,639	---
Subtotal.....	162,042	139,783	139,783	-22,259	---
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	---	105	105	+105	---
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.....	---	3,235	---	---	-3,235
Total, Loan subsidies.....	195,492	161,243	158,008	-37,484	-3,235
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)....	281,350	305,011	289,445	+8,095	-15,566
Administrative expenses.....	7,901	8,000	8,000	+99	---
Total, ACIF expenses.....	289,251	313,011	297,445	+8,194	-15,566
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund... (Loan authorization).....	484,743 (3,246,249)	474,254 (3,803,253)	455,453 (3,818,253)	-29,290 (+572,004)	-18,801 (+15,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,471,728	1,486,231	1,467,150	-4,578	-19,081
Risk Management Agency.....	71,001	91,582	72,044	+1,043	-19,538
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,543,360	1,578,746	1,539,825	-3,535	-38,921
=====					
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	3,765,000	4,095,128	4,095,128	+330,128	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	22,937,000	16,452,377	16,452,377	-6,484,623	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Total, Corporations.....	26,702,000	20,547,505	20,547,505	-6,154,495	---
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	32,848,079	26,962,522	27,010,878	-5,837,201	+48,356
(By transfer).....	(283,244)	(309,163)	(291,747)	(+8,503)	(-17,416)
(Loan authorization).....	(3,246,249)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,253)	(+572,004)	(+15,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(110,040)	(111,922)	(111,922)	(+1,882)	---
=====					

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	741	936	731	-10	-205
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations.....	847,971	710,412	813,673	-34,298	+103,261
Watershed surveys and planning.....	10,500	5,083	11,083	+583	+6,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	86,487	40,173	86,487	---	+46,314
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	29,629	10,091	30,091	+462	+20,000
Resource conservation and development.....	51,641	50,760	51,641	---	+881
Farm bill technical assistance.....	---	92,024	---	---	-92,024
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service...	1,026,228	908,543	992,975	-33,253	+84,432
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	1,026,969	909,479	993,706	-33,263	+84,227
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development...	632	929	632	---	-297
Rural Development:					
Rural community advancement program.....	752,956	541,979	667,408	-85,548	+125,429
Tree assistance (sec. 747).....	---	---	---	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-28,000)	---	---	(+28,000)	---
Total, Rural community advancement program..	752,956	541,979	667,408	-85,548	+125,429
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	141,032	149,749	143,625	+2,593	-6,124
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(440,687)	(465,886)	(448,889)	(+8,202)	(-16,997)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,247)	(6,656)	(4,321)	(+74)	(-2,335)
(Transfer from RETLP).....	(37,630)	(39,933)	(38,323)	(+693)	(-1,610)
(Transfer from RTB).....	(3,152)	(3,328)	(3,152)	---	(-176)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.	(485,716)	(515,803)	(494,685)	(+8,969)	(-21,118)
Total, RD expenses.....	(626,748)	(665,552)	(638,310)	(+11,562)	(-27,242)
Total, Rural Development.....	893,988	691,728	811,033	-82,955	+119,305
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	(1,351,397)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(-251,397)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(2,709,094)	(2,725,185)	(3,309,297)	(+600,203)	(+584,112)
Subtotal, Single family.....	(4,060,491)	(3,825,185)	(4,409,297)	(+348,806)	(+584,112)
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	(34,797)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(+203)	---
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(115,857)	(60,000)	(116,063)	(+206)	(+56,063)
Site loans (sec. 524).....	(5,045)	(5,045)	(5,045)	---	---
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,410)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+590)	---
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	(1,491)	(1,501)	(1,501)	(+10)	---
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(2,421)	(5,000)	(10,000)	(+7,579)	(+5,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(4,329,512)	(4,041,731)	(4,686,906)	(+357,394)	(+645,175)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	125,274	127,380	127,380	+2,106	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	39,668	33,608	33,608	-6,060	---
Subtotal, Single family.....	164,942	160,988	160,988	-3,954	---
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	9,555	10,171	10,171	+616	---
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	49,830	28,254	54,654	+4,824	+26,400
Site loans (sec. 524).....	---	---	---	---	---
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	5,915	3,490	3,490	-2,425	---
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	659	727	727	+68	---
Single family housing credit sales.....	---	---	---	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	75	---	---	-75	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	230,976	203,630	230,030	-946	+26,400
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).	440,687	465,886	448,889	+8,202	-16,997
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521).....	574,689	586,100	586,100	+11,411	---
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)).....	5,865	5,900	5,900	+35	---
Total, Rental assistance program.....	580,554	592,000	592,000	+11,446	---
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund.....	1,252,217	1,261,516	1,270,919	+18,702	+9,403
(Loan authorization).....	(4,329,512)	(4,041,731)	(4,686,906)	(+357,394)	(+645,175)
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	33,799	34,000	34,000	+201	---
Rural housing assistance grants.....	45,949	42,500	42,500	-3,449	---
Farm labor program account.....	36,093	36,765	36,765	+672	---
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	115,841	113,265	113,265	-2,576	---
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,368,058	1,374,781	1,384,184	+16,126	+9,403
(Loan authorization).....	(4,329,512)	(4,041,731)	(4,686,906)	(+357,394)	(+645,175)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(39,764)	(34,213)	(34,213)	(-5,551)	---
Loan subsidy.....	17,206	15,868	15,868	-1,338	---
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	4,247	6,656	4,321	+74	-2,335
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund.....	21,453	22,524	20,189	-1,264	-2,335
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(14,914)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(+10,089)	---
Direct subsidy.....	2,776	4,698	4,698	+1,922	---
Rural cooperative development grants.....	23,858	21,000	23,500	-358	+2,500
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants.....	12,592	---	11,419	-1,173	+11,419
Renewable energy program.....	22,864	10,770	15,000	-7,864	+4,230
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.....	83,543	58,992	74,806	-8,737	+15,814
(Loan authorization).....	(54,678)	(59,216)	(59,216)	(+4,538)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans					
Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	(240,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(-120,000)	---
Direct, Municipal rate.....	(1,000,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-900,000)	---
Direct, FFB.....	(1,900,000)	(1,620,000)	(2,000,000)	(+100,000)	(+380,000)
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(750,000)	(700,000)	(1,000,000)	(+250,000)	(+300,000)
Guaranteed electric.....	(99,410)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+590)	---
Guaranteed underwriting.....	(1,000,000)	---	(1,000,000)	---	(+1,000,000)
Subtotal, Electric.....	(4,989,410)	(2,640,000)	(4,320,000)	(-669,410)	(+1,680,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%.....	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(248,525)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(+1,475)	---
Direct, FFB.....	(120,000)	(100,000)	(125,000)	(+5,000)	(+25,000)
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	(513,525)	(495,000)	(520,000)	(+6,475)	(+25,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(5,502,935)	(3,135,000)	(4,840,000)	(-662,935)	(+1,705,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	---	3,648	3,648	+3,648	---
Direct, Municipal rate.....	---	1,350	1,350	+1,350	---
Guaranteed electric.....	60	60	60	---	---
Subtotal, Electric.....	60	5,058	5,058	+4,998	---
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%.....	---	---	---	---	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	124	100	100	-24	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	124	100	100	-24	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	184	5,158	5,158	+4,974	---
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	37,630	39,933	38,323	+693	-1,610
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account..	37,814	45,091	43,481	+5,667	-1,610
(Loan authorization).....	(5,502,935)	(3,135,000)	(4,840,000)	(-662,935)	(+1,705,000)
=====					
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(173,503)	---	(175,000)	(+1,497)	(+175,000)
Direct loan subsidy.....	---	---	---	---	---
RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD)..	3,152	3,328	3,152	---	-176
Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account.	3,152	3,328	3,152	---	-176
High energy costs grants (by transfer).....	(27,835)	---	---	(-27,835)	---
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Distance learning and telemedicine.....	(300,000)	---	(50,000)	(-250,000)	(+50,000)
Broadband telecommunications.....	(598,101)	(331,081)	(464,038)	(-134,063)	(+132,957)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(898,101)	(331,081)	(514,038)	(-384,063)	(+182,957)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Loan subsidies:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Direct.....	---	---	710	+710	+710
Grants.....	38,770	25,000	25,000	-13,770	---
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct.....	13,039	9,884	9,884	-3,155	---
Grants.....	8,947	---	9,000	+53	+9,000
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	60,756	34,884	44,594	-16,162	+9,710
=====					
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	101,722	83,303	91,227	-10,495	+7,924
(Loan authorization).....	(6,574,539)	(3,466,081)	(5,529,038)	(-1,045,501)	(+2,062,957)
=====					
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs.....	2,447,943	2,209,733	2,361,882	-86,061	+152,149
(By transfer).....	(513,551)	(515,803)	(494,685)	(-18,866)	(-21,118)
(Loan authorization).....	(10,958,729)	(7,567,028)	(10,275,160)	(-683,569)	(+2,708,132)
=====					
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	595	799	595	---	-204
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs.....	6,717,780	6,060,860	6,227,595	-490,185	+166,735
Transfer from section 32.....	4,699,661	5,319,697	5,152,962	+453,301	-166,735
Discretionary spending.....	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	11,417,441	11,380,557	11,380,557	-36,884	---
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	4,611,861	4,787,250	4,907,250	+295,389	+120,000
Food stamp program:					
Expenses.....	26,403,176	30,501,798	29,047,276	+2,644,100	-1,454,522
Reserve.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	---	---
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,402,805	---	1,448,522	+45,717	+1,448,522
The emergency food assistance program.....	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---
Total, Food stamp program.....	30,945,981	33,641,798	33,635,798	+2,689,817	-6,000
Commodity assistance program.....	149,115	169,416	178,797	+29,682	+9,381
Nutrition programs administration.....	137,488	152,227	133,742	-3,746	-18,485
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	47,261,886	50,131,248	50,236,144	+2,974,258	+104,896
=====					
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	47,262,481	50,132,047	50,236,739	+2,974,258	+104,692
=====					

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	131,368	143,077	137,722	+6,354	-5,355
(Transfer from export loans).....	(3,286)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(+154)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,069)	(1,102)	(1,102)	(+33)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses program level.....	(135,723)	(147,619)	(142,264)	(+6,541)	(-5,355)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Program account:					
Loan authorization, direct.....	(130,892)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-30,892)	---
Loan subsidies.....	103,274	86,420	86,420	-16,854	---
Ocean freight differential grants.....	27,835	22,723	22,723	-5,112	---
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(1,184,967)	(1,185,000)	(1,180,002)	(-4,965)	(-4,998)
Appropriation.....	1,184,967	1,185,000	1,180,002	-4,965	-4,998
Salaries and expenses:					
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	1,069	1,102	1,102	+33	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	1,053	3,119	1,269	+216	-1,850
Subtotal.....	2,122	4,221	2,371	+249	-1,850
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,184,967)	(1,185,000)	(1,180,002)	(-4,965)	(-4,998)
Appropriation.....	1,318,198	1,298,364	1,291,516	-26,682	-6,848
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	3,286	3,440	3,440	+154	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	841	1,033	1,033	+192	---
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	4,127	4,473	4,473	+346	---
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants.....	49,705	75,000	75,000	+25,295	---
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,503,398	1,520,914	1,508,711	+5,313	-12,203
(By transfer).....	(4,355)	(4,542)	(4,542)	(+187)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs Request
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	1,378,779	1,494,517	1,462,517	+83,738	-32,000
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(249,825)	(284,394)	(284,394)	(+34,569)	---
Medical device user fee act.....	(31,654)	(33,938)	(33,938)	(+2,284)	---
Animal drug user fee act.....	(5,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(+3,000)	---
Subtotal.....	(1,665,258)	(1,820,849)	(1,788,849)	(+123,591)	(-32,000)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings).....	(16,576)	(16,919)	(16,919)	(+343)	---
Export and color certification.....	(6,649)	(6,838)	(6,838)	(+189)	---
Payments to GSA.....	(119,594)	(123,015)	(129,815)	(+10,221)	(+6,800)
Buildings and facilities.....	6,959	---	---	-6,959	---
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	1,385,738	1,494,517	1,462,517	+76,779	-32,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	89,901	95,327	93,327	+3,426	-2,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,900)	---	(42,900)	(+2,000)	(+42,900)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	1,475,639	1,589,844	1,555,844	+80,205	-34,000
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Hunger fellowships.....	2,982	---	2,500	-482	+2,500
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund.....	496	---	500	+4	+500
Tree assistance (sec. 747).....	14,912	---	---	-14,912	---
Northern Great Plains Regional Authority.....	1,491	---	---	-1,491	---
Denali Commission.....	994	---	---	-994	---
Food stamp program freeze.....	1,988	---	---	-1,988	---
Total, title VII, General provisions.....	22,863	---	3,000	-19,863	+3,000
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L.108-199) Conservation Programs					
Natural Resources Conservation Service (Sec. 102(d)):					
Emergency watershed protection program (emergency)	149,115	---	---	-149,115	---
Tree assistance program (emergency) (Sec. 102(e)).....	12,426	---	---	-12,426	---
Emergency conservation prog. (emergency) (Sec. 102(f))	12,426	---	---	-12,426	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Livestock indemnity prog. (emergency) (Sec.102(g))	497	---	---	-497	---
Total, Other appropriations.....	174,464	---	---	-174,464	---
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	86,761,836	83,324,539	83,670,760	-3,091,076	+346,221
Appropriations.....	(86,587,372)	(83,324,539)	(83,670,760)	(-2,916,612)	(+346,221)
Emergency Appropriations.....	174,464	---	---	-174,464	---
(By transfer).....	(801,150)	(829,508)	(790,974)	(-10,176)	(-38,534)
(Loan authorization).....	(14,335,870)	(11,470,281)	(14,193,413)	(-142,457)	(+2,723,132)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(150,940)	(111,922)	(154,822)	(+3,882)	(+42,900)

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), for a very good working relationship this year and the type of hearings that help us all build a better Nation.

This fiscal 2005 agriculture appropriation bill has been put together under some of the most trying budget circumstances that we have ever seen. And even though this is an appropriation bill, and I guess people refer to it as one of those green-eyeshade bills, it is important for the American people to know that what this bill is really all about is that no child in our country should go hungry; that American agriculture begins to regain some global market edge internationally; and that we keep winning more markets rather than losing markets, and taking actions that can help that.

This bill affects every American consumer in whether or not the meat that we eat is safe. It involves new research into the new plants, many of them undergirding new medicines of the future. Really, the best agriculture and food and drug research in the world. This bill touches every single person in our country and so many people around the world.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) for all his efforts, as well as the majority staff, under the direction of our new majority clerk, Martin Delgado, who is joined by Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, Joanne Perdue, and our detailees Tom O'Brien and Mike Gregoire. I also want to thank our minority clerk, who is with us here tonight, Martha Foley, for her efforts not only on behalf of our membership but of our entire country, for her very, very hard and largely unrecognized work.

Last year, I described this bill as a size 7 shoe for a size 10 foot. Well, it is a new year now. We have 293 million Americans in our country, more than last year. But, unfortunately, the bill this year has an even smaller shoe size but a bigger foot. Our needs are increasing as a country, but our resources are increasing. So we now have a size 6 shoe for a size 11 foot. And if you think the bunions are starting to pinch now, new stories regarding the early steps in preparing for next year's bill suggests matters will only be getting worse. Much more difficult.

The bill before us today provides a total of slightly more than \$83 billion, that is no small change, with nearly \$66 billion, or 80 percent, four-fifths of the bill, that we are mandated to spend. That means that programs, such as our Food Stamp program, we must spend those dollars to meet growing needs in the country. And in this year's bill that totals about \$33 billion.

If you think the economy is improving, you will not find evidence of that claim in this bill. In fact, this bill con-

tains \$16.772 billion in what we call discretionary spending. That is the part of the bill where we can really try to direct resources to very important needs in the country, but this year we have a \$67 million reduction over the prior year. And, in fact, it is a 6 percent reduction compared to 2 years ago for the fiscal 2003 budget. In fact, it is \$1.100 billion below that.

So this bill is not going up by any measure. And with more mandatory spending necessary to meet unmet economic needs, that cuts into the discretionary spending that we have so many draws upon all over this country.

The people who live in agricultural America and our small towns have the same needs and concerns as their friends in big cities. They need jobs, and more often than not are experiencing plant shutdowns. There are huge job washouts in many small towns in this country. And, in fact, there are no new employers that are readily seen on the horizon. We have offshoring of so much of our work and higher unemployment in many, many corners of rural America. People there need health care, but often have fewer hospitals, or much longer distances to travel to secure care. And the accounts in this bill dealing with telemedicine for rural America are severely underfunded.

People in rural America want economic development, but they find the services available to them are so over-subscribed or heavily weighted towards loan, that they often cannot get the assistance they need. People in rural America want community services, but they find that their smaller population base and smaller economic base make it even harder to finance the water and sewer systems, clean water systems, the power utility systems, and the telecommunication systems that so many other Americans, frankly, take for granted.

So the fiscal 2005 agriculture appropriation bill is a classic exercise in the futility of a budget process that has effectively obligated the bulk of Federal funds before we have really had a fair opportunity to address all the needs of our Nation here at home. Decisions made in recent years by some in this Congress on taxes and on foreign policy are sapping our ability to meet real domestic obligations.

To date, our country has spent over \$100 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that number grows every day. Imagine if we could take that money and divide it, \$2 billion for each of our 50 States to share with their local towns and cities, what an incredible difference that would make.

□ 2015

But that is not the choice that we will make tonight.

I know that while the gentleman from Texas worked to provide funding within our restrictive allocation, there are a number of shortcomings that we need to recognize. Because of these

budget limitations, the bill before us will cut the community facilities program by \$36 million, so all the Members that asked us for more help for their particular communities, we could not do that.

In the rural water and sewer grant program, we are \$86 million underfunded. That is just to meet where we were last year, because the needs are so much greater.

It looks as though we are going to be at least \$150 million short in the women, infants and children's food program, WIC, and nearly \$15 million short in the commodity supplemental food program under this bill, despite appreciated increases. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his efforts there.

At the same time, we are also in this bill forced to debate tomorrow cutting renewable energy programs. We are also not funding needed market development tools. And we have a Department of Agriculture that may be preparing to extend additional credits to Iraq, but meanwhile forgiving \$4 billion in accumulated principal and interest owed by the Rafidain Bank of Iraq. We want to make sure that whatever is done relative to Iraq upholds existing law and does not permit the type of fraud that occurred during the 1980s and 1990s and the misuse of the Commodity Credit Corporation programs in arming Saddam Hussein and strengthening his power. That was done during the Reagan-Bush administrations and the Bush-Quayle administrations, over the strong objections of this Congress.

They say that we cannot expand the senior farmers market program to all States so that needy seniors can purchase locally grown fruit and vegetables from farmers who earn from the market, not transfer payments. Yet we know that over half the States in the Union still do not even have beginning funds to bring that important program on-line to really help farmers who are diversified close to our cities.

In international trade, there continues a downward trend as the U.S. moves for the first time in its history toward becoming a net food importer. Meanwhile, the Department of Agriculture cannot give us effective solutions for controlling and assessing liability for invasive species that are a huge and rising cost to the American taxpayer due to misapplied free trade policies, mismanaged, misapplied, misguided.

In this bill, there are hundreds of millions of dollars of tax money that has to be diverted to take care of the Asian longhorn beetle in New York, Chicago and many other places and the emerald ash borer in places like Michigan and Ohio. Those bills should not come to rest at the foot of the American taxpayer. They should be paid for by the commercial interests that bring those critters into this country, and they should not be getting off Scott free for the damage that they are causing. Nonetheless, we have to fund those

remediation programs in this bill. Those costs have been rising exponentially during this decade of the 1990s and into this new millennium.

Officials that are charged with ensuring the safety of our food supply cannot answer basic questions about how many cattle have been tested to ensure public health and safety or tell us when procedures for dealing with this national need will at long last be satisfied. It is amazing that the Department of Agriculture cannot do that. What a shame.

Meanwhile, export markets remain closed even to producers who are willing to pay themselves for the testing so that our export customers can reopen their markets. America's family farmers and ranchers have always had a vision for America's future. They daily demonstrate a willingness to work harder and smarter than their competitors. They possess a keen appreciation for the fact that their accomplishments provide a safe and bountiful food supply which allows most Americans to expend their energies in other industries and business endeavors. We need to support the efforts of these productive Americans by providing them with the tools for continued success, fair prices, fair trade policies, fair access to new technologies, and fair and consistent standards imposed on imported products that do not place economic burdens on domestic producers.

Mr. Chairman, in closing my more formal remarks this evening, let me just say that it has been a great pleasure to work on both sides of the aisle to complete the bill that we will bring to the floor tomorrow for amendment. We look forward to working with our colleagues on completing it tomorrow.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier, Mr. Chairman, I recognized the fine work that the subcommittee staff has done. I would now like to single out a young man in my office, Walt Smith, a fine young man from Hillsboro, Texas, that is known to all agriculture interests and groups around the country, who worked side by side with the subcommittee staff to put this bill together. We wanted to acknowledge the good work that he does as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the distinguished vice chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas knows, I have been and remain concerned about the funding level for the renewable energy program. The bill before us today funds this program at \$15 million; and even though this funding level is a \$4.2 million increase above the budget request, it is \$8 million below the fiscal year 2004 funding level.

As we have discussed, this program is important to Iowa and the whole country, particularly in the wind and biomass areas, because it makes grants available to rural, small businesses, agricultural producers and others who purchase renewable energy systems or make energy improvements. This program has the potential to improve rural living standards and economic opportunities and to create jobs. In short, there is a significant value-added component for rural areas that comes with this program.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BONILLA. The gentleman from Iowa has been a champion of the renewable energy program, and I think all of his constituents back home clearly understand that. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and I have appreciated his input on this subject as we have been putting this bill together. As we have discussed, this year has been a difficult one in terms of funding decisions we have had to make.

Mr. LATHAM. I know that the chairman has worked very hard to fashion a balanced bill and that he has done everything possible to accommodate the concerns of all Members. I had intended to offer an amendment to increase the renewable energy funding level by \$8 million. However, with the chairman's assurances that we will work in conference to raise the funding level of this program, I will not offer that amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has my assurances that I will work with him and do everything I can to increase the renewable energy program funding level in conference. Again, I congratulate the gentleman for his stout work on this issue day in and day out.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I look forward to working with him on this.

Mr. Chairman, I want to encourage Members to support this bill as it is a well-balanced measure. The chairman has done an outstanding job of trying to ensure that sufficient resources are available for the broad range of programs that are funded under this bill.

Like many of the Members, I have my thoughts as to some programs that I wish could be a bit more generously funded, but given the need to produce a balanced product under the agricultural allocation, I am pleased with this bill.

I want to comment on a few other areas of interest that I believe are important beyond the renewable energy program that the chairman and I just discussed. For example, we must continue to focus on agricultural research which I think is an area that holds great promise for the future of agriculture economies and the consuming public that those economies feed.

I also think that we should remain diligent about the development of an

animal identification program that is reliable and easy to work with for all parties needing to access it. In this regard, it is important that we have adequate resources for animal health monitoring and surveillance, and this bill contains such resources.

Also, I want to mention my support for land conservation which this bill funds. In this regard, I know many Members have constituencies with interests in the conservation security program. The program is of considerable interest in Iowa, not only among those in the agriculture production arena but also those who are generally concerned about the environment in general. I share that concern and want to see the conservation security program as a concept developed in an optimal way. On the other hand, it would be unwise to begin full-scale implementation of the CSP and spend billions of dollars before that program is fine-tuned.

In numerous conversations that I and my staff have had about the CSP in Iowa and elsewhere, the prevailing view is that the CSP program needs work. Both corn and soybean association representatives as well as others with whom I have talked support CSP, but at this point they believe that the program is not ready to go forward at full speed.

I also want to personally thank the chairman and the staff that did such a tremendous job on this bill.

One extraordinarily important item in the bill is the full funding for the National Animal Disease Center at Ames, Iowa. It is a large number in the bill. It is one that the staff and the chairman have really worked hard to secure those funds for us. I certainly thank the President for including funding for the Animal Disease Center in his budget request. This is an extraordinarily important facility similar to the CDC for livestock and animals and very, very important for the security of our Nation, when we talk about anthrax, when we talk about mad cow disease, all of those things. It is very, very important that we have this facility on-line and that it is completed on a timely, expedited basis.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a very respected and extraordinarily hard-working member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for being a member of this great committee.

I want to compliment the chairman on the good work done in bringing this bill to the floor, but I also want to point out I think something that all of us on the committee, the committee that spends the money on agriculture in America and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, what we realize is a problem, and that is that we have in this great country of ours, we still have nutritional problems and people going to bed at night hungry.

One of the big difficulties in the way the budget process is set up in this country is that 80 to 85 percent of the money we spend goes to mandatory food programs. That leaves only about 16 percent or so that is discretionary. Why we need to have more input into how the Federal Government spends its money on food and nutrition is because half of the budget of the USDA is dedicated towards nutrition. So it is not a small program. It is more than half of the entire budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. That is important. That is good. That is a good priority. But we still have areas where the demand is increasing.

Frankly, food and nutrition is so essential to life and we talk on the committee about problems we are having with obesity, what we ought to be doing with our nutritional programs, particularly in schools as we feed kids. The United States government has some specialized programs in the school lunch program and the school breakfast program, and we assist schools. Those are for kids who come from a low-income family, but essentially the school lunch program that all the kids eat is a public policy because it is run by the schools, and in that program alone you will notice that when I look through what America buys to feed kids, it is not exactly the same as what we have invested money in doing research on, in telling people what is healthy for Americans. That is, our nutritional voice does not meet our spending practices.

I am a big advocate for trying to get more fresh fruits and vegetables in schools. Schools have used the school lunch program and school breakfast program to provide for vending machines in schools, for finding other ways to raise money and have not really paid attention to the fact that the health of the children and the students is really dependent on how well they are fed and how good that health is. The committee has addressed a lot of these issues, but we are also faced with the same problems that other committees are and that is our discretionary funding is limited.

□ 2030

And what we have seen with that is the food stamps, as the economy goes up and down, and as the Members know, it has been sort of in a recession in the last few years, that means more people have been unemployed. Yes, we see people getting back on the employment rolls, and that is a good thing; but we still have had since 2001 a 45 percent increase in demand for the food stamp program.

We have taken a lot of steps in that area to try to streamline it and better manage the program through automatic debit cards, to swipe cards rather than having to go through the line and go through this ticket process of whether the stamps one is using are eligible to buy the product that they picked off the shelf, and the debit card

allows it to show that right away on the computer and does not sort of put the recipient and the cashier in an awkward situation.

The WIC program, the Women, Infants and Children, we have a program in America to feed women who are expecting in prenatal conditions and in postnatal conditions, giving them nutritious food to feed the infant. It is a very successful program. It is one that America can be very proud of. But we see that may need an increase, meaning that people just do not have the resources to buy that kind of food, or it is not readily available in their neighborhood.

I have spoken of a school lunch and school breakfast program. We have a Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program called TEFAP. The money that has been flatlined for a number of years, we may need in the future to increase that.

We have the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. That is mainly the things we have seen, Meals on Wheels and other entities taken to senior citizens where the commodity foods are put into a local senior citizen nutritional program. The money has been frozen in that despite the fact that we have an aging population in America; and as that aging population increases, and it is going to increase tremendously because I was just told the demographics of California, the census data shows that by the year 2015, one out of every five persons over the age of 65 will live in the State of California, that is going to be a huge burden on the State. It could also be a great asset because these people have come with a lot of experiences; but on the other hand, as we know, the aging population is staying alive longer, and we are going to need more services, and those are usually expensive services. So these types of programs may be hurt in the future if they are flatlined.

So the point of my raising this is that I am really excited to be a member of this committee. I think it is a tremendous committee that works in a very strong, bipartisan fashion. The chairman has been excellent. The staff has been excellent. The other members of the committee, we all get along very well and try to work out our differences. And what I am trying to point out in my comment today is that despite the good workings inside Congress and despite the fact that we are the wealthiest country on the Earth and the most agriculturally abundant and productive, I mean just in abundance alone, one of the three counties I represent produces 85 crops.

When I talked to Members here in Congress and to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I found that there was no other State in the United States that produced 85 crops alone. California, being the largest ag State, has the greatest variety in it, and what I would like to see our country do is move more into buying the fruits and vegetables and the things that we de-

scribe in our nutrition. Frankly, the things we see in all these fad diets that are going on right now, those are all about healthy foods and healthy fruits and vegetables, and if we use the government resources to purchase those more and get those into the school lunch program, into the WIC program, into the feeding programs, into the senior meals programs, and, frankly, into our institutional feeding. We feed the military. We feed hospitals. We feed big institutions like the Federal Prison System. If we could get our sister States and counties and cities to be able to work on their institutional feeding, we could do a much better job of getting the kind of food that is necessary to the people who need it, and we could have a better distribution of how agriculture functions in America.

So I want to compliment the committee on the direction it is headed. I think we have a few problems on the horizon. I think if we put our minds to it, we can address those.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), a new Congresswoman, who will provide to this Congress a much-needed, strong voice for agriculture and rural area.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I rise this evening in support of this legislation. It provides essential funding for programs important to farmers, ranchers, and consumers across South Dakota. I am pleased that it contains increases in funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service by \$45 million and for the Food and Drug Administration by \$72 million. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking member, as well as other members of the subcommittee and their staff for working together to forge the difficult compromises that are evident in this bill.

I do, however, want to voice a couple of concerns I have about funding levels for some of the programs addressed in this appropriations measure. I have heard from several of my constituents, concerns about funding levels for two very important programs in South Dakota. One of the programs I hear about consistently from the agricultural producers in my State is the Environmental Quality Incentives Program or EQIP. EQIP offers financial and technical assistance for eligible farmers and ranchers to enable them to implement environmentally beneficial land management practices.

I am pleased that EQIP was reauthorized in the 2002 farm bill and given increasing authorization levels over the next several years. Unfortunately, I feel this appropriations bill significantly underfunds this important program. It falls \$190 million below what the 2002 farm bill had authorized. I understand and appreciate the need for

fiscal restraint, but I disagree with some of the priorities reflected in this bill, particularly the funding level for the EQIP program.

The ramifications of this funding level are made quite clear when we consider the backlog of projects that exist under this important program. By some estimates, the backlog for EQIP funding nationwide is in excess of \$1 billion, with the backlog in South Dakota alone in the tens of millions of dollars. These are commendable projects that do a great deal to improve water quality and wildlife habitat across the country.

I appreciate the stringent budgetary constraints under which we are currently operating, but this is not the program that should be the target of such substantial cuts.

Another important program is the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program, or WHIP. WHIP is a voluntary program for people who want to develop and improve wildlife habitat on private land. USDA provides both technical assistance and up to 75 percent cost-share assistance to establish and improve fish and wildlife habitat.

WHIP has proven to be a highly-effective and widely-accepted program across the country. By targeting wildlife habitat projects, WHIP provides assistance to conservation-minded landowners who are unable to meet the specific eligibility requirements of other USDA conservation programs.

Unfortunately, this bill would fund WHIP at \$25 million below its authorized levels for fiscal year 2005. While \$25 million may not seem like a large sum of money relative to other amounts considered by this body, keep in mind that this bill funds the entire program at \$60 million. The difference between \$85 million and \$60 million is almost 30 percent. This is a significant shortfall, and one I think should be reevaluated in conference.

Again, I voice my overall support for this legislation and will vote in favor of final passage, but I am concerned with some of the funding choices that were made. I urge my colleagues that will serve as conferees to seek additional funding for both the EQIP and WHIP programs.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), chairman of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

For the past 3 years, the committee and Congress have supported funding for the Tri-States Joint Peanut Research project between Auburn University, the University of Florida, and the University of Georgia. In the past this project has focused on a sod-based rota-

tion with peanuts, cotton, and other row crops.

This year the project was renamed the Tri-States Initiative to incorporate fruits, nut crops, and vegetables in the rotation. This created some confusion and was unfortunately viewed as a new start and subsequently received no funding. As the gentleman is aware, producers in southern States face the problem of compacted soils, which can be greatly improved with the use of proper crop rotation. This research would allow southeastern producers to make informed decisions on how to diversify their operations while increasing farm profitability and improving soil characteristics.

The Tri-States Initiative is a reasonable extension of a previously funded project. Since the project was viewed as a new start, I ask the chairman to be supportive of restoring the fiscal year 2004 funding for the project in conference.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman is correct. The naming of this program did cause confusion, but it is clear that this is a continuation of the program that the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Subcommittee has funded for the past 3 years. The Tri-State Initiative conducts important commodity research in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia; and I would be happy to work with the gentleman to restore funding for this program in conference.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his response, and I appreciate his willingness to work with me in conference to restore this important program.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we close this evening, I just want to say that the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) and I intend to offer a biofuels amendment tomorrow to the bill with great hope that we can help push America into a new energy age, a new renewable energy age, starting right in rural America; and I wanted to acknowledge that while she is still on the floor with us tonight.

I did also want to, for the record, thank deeply Roger Szemraj of our own staff for the tremendous work that he does and for the time he takes away from his own family to be with us even tonight on this floor as we move this important bill for fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING) having assumed the chair, Mr. TERRY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2045

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). 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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas 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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE GARRETT LEE SMITH MEMORIAL ACT

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, I rise today to discuss a subject that is very difficult for many of us to address, and that is the subject of suicide.

Last Friday, along with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), I introduced H.R. 4799, the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act. This legislation offers a comprehensive strategy toward addressing suicide, suicide prevention and mental health in high schools and on college campuses.

So why is it important to address this critical issue? I would like people to consider these facts.

Number one, more children and young adults die from suicide each year than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, stroke and chronic lung disease combined.

Number two, over 4,000 children and young adults take their own lives

every year, making suicide the third overall cause of death between the ages of 10 and 24.

From 1952 to 1995, the rate of suicide in children and young adults has tripled.

The American College Health Association found that 61 percent of college students reported feeling hopeless, 45 percent said they feel so depressed they could barely function, and 9 percent felt they were suicidal.

According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, depression among college freshmen has nearly doubled to 16.3 percent. I find these statistics very troubling and somewhat alarming.

According to the 2001 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 20 percent of full-time undergraduate college students use illicit drugs, and 18.4 percent of adults ages 18 to 24 are dependent on or are abusing illicit drugs or alcohol, and all of this drug abuse and alcohol abuse oftentimes leads to suicide as well.

The Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act works to address in a proactive way this national problem.

The legislation consists of two parts: Part one provides grant funding to States for development of a youth suicide prevention and intervention strategy through educational systems, juvenile justice systems, local governments and private nonprofit entities that are engaged in activities focused on mental health. The bill also provides for screening programs for youth that can identify mental health and behavioral conditions that place youth at risk for suicide. The bill also establishes a Federal Suicide Prevention Technical Assistance Center.

Part 2 of this bill provides grant funding to colleges and universities to establish or enhance their mental health outreach and treatment centers and enhance their focus on youth suicide prevention and intervention.

The bill authorizes a total of \$15 million for fiscal year 2005, gradually increasing funding over the next 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a minute and discuss the genesis of this particular legislation. This bill is named in honor of the son of Senator GORDON SMITH of Oregon. Garrett Lee was his son and took his life last year after several years of struggle with bipolar disorder. Senator SMITH and his wife, Sharon, are determined to turn their private tragedy into something positive. I admire the Smith family's courage in speaking publicly about their son, and I hope that their efforts will raise awareness and save other young people from the same fate. I invite other Members of the House to support this important legislation.

There was a time when suicide was not mentioned. However, only when we openly discuss the problem, confront the statistics, and work towards solutions such as those proposed by the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act can we start to prevent these tragedies from happening.

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER 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 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 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.)

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

(Mr. GINGREY 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.)

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2005 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2005 THROUGH FY 2009

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2005 and for the 5-year period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the Conference Report on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005 (S. Con. Res. 95), which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House under H. Res. 649. This status report is current through July 9, 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by S. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget reso-

lution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2005 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under S. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 through 2009. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2005 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2006 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of S. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2005 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN S. CON. RES. 95, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 9, 2004

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2005	Fiscal years 2005-2009
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,012,726	(1)
Outlays	2,010,964	(1)
Revenues	1,454,637	8,638,287
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,165,717	(1)
Outlays	1,489,191	(1)
Revenues	1,482,789	8,687,742
Current Level over (+) / under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	-847,009	(1)
Outlays	-521,773	(1)
Revenues	28,152	49,455

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2006 through 2009 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2005 in excess of \$847,009,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2005 in excess of \$521,773,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2005 in excess of

\$28,152,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 in excess of \$49,455,000,000 (if not already included in the current level

estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by S. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 9, 2004
(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2005		2005–2009 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	68	56	236	230
Current Level	66	57	234	226
Difference	-2	1	-2	-4
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	576	483	4,350	3,381
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-576	-483	-4,350	-3,381
Financial Services:				
Allocation	1	1	17	17
Current Level	-1	-1	-5	-5
Difference	-2	-2	-22	-22
Government Reform:				
Allocation	1	1	19	19
Current Level	1	1	19	19
Difference	0	0	0	0
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
Allocation	15	15	35	35
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-15	-15	-35	-35
Resources:				
Allocation	2	2	10	10
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-2	-2	-10	-10
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	1,737	4	22,070	12
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-1,737	-4	-22,070	-12
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	1,368	804	3,470	3,244
Current Level	122	138	133	174
Difference	-1,246	-666	-3,337	-3,070
Reconciliation	0	0	4,600	4,600
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	-4,600	-4,600

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of June 15, 2004 (H. Rpt. 108-543)		Current level reflecting action completed as of July 9, 2004		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	16,772	18,113	14	5,351	-16,758	-12,762
Commerce, Justice, State	39,815	40,463	0	11,825	-39,815	-28,638
National Defense	390,931	415,987	17	149,234	-390,914	-266,753
District of Columbia	560	554	0	60	-560	-494
Energy & Water Development	27,988	27,972	0	9,558	-27,988	-18,414
Foreign Operations	19,386	26,735	0	19,813	-19,386	-6,922
Homeland Security	32,000	29,873	2,528	12,126	-29,472	-17,747
Interior	19,999	20,208	36	6,364	-19,963	-13,844
Labor, HHS & Education	142,526	141,117	19,151	96,225	-123,375	-44,892
Legislative Branch	3,575	3,696	0	708	-3,575	-2,988
Military Construction	10,003	10,015	0	7,557	-10,003	-2,458
Transportation-Treasury	25,434	69,283	37	38,224	-25,397	-31,059
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	92,930	101,732	2,198	48,957	-90,732	-52,775
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	821,919	905,748	23,981	406,002	-797,938	-499,746

Statement of FY2006 Advance Appropriations Under Section 401 of S. Con. Res. 95—Reflecting Action Completed as of July 9, 2004

(In millions of dollars)

	<i>Budget Authority</i>
Appropriate Level	23,158
Current Level:	
Interior Subcommittee:	
Elk Hills	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Transportation and Treasury Subcommittee:	
Payment to Postal Service	0

<i>Budget Authority</i>	
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee:	
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	0

Current Level over (+) / under (–)
Appropriate Level

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2004.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2005 budget and is current through July 9, 2004. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to

the House to reflect funding for wildland fire suppression and for technical reasons. These revisions are authorized by sections 312 and 313 of S. Con. Res. 95.

Since the beginning of the second session of the 108th Congress, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for 2005:

The TANF and Related Programs Continuation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-262);

The Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-264);

The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-265);

The GAO Human Capital Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-272);

An act to renew import restrictions on Burma (Public Law 108-272).

In addition, the Congress has cleared the following legislation for the President's signature: The AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (H.R. 4103).

This is my first report for fiscal year 2005.

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2005 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JULY 9, 2004
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,482,831
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,179,653	1,133,168	n.a.
Appropriation legislation ¹	0	391,841	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-398,008	-398,008	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions	781,645	1,127,001	1,482,831
Enacted this session:			
TANF and Related Programs Continuation Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-262)	122	138	0
Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-264)	-1	-1	0
Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-265)	66	57	0
GAO Human Capital Reform Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-271)	1	1	0
An act to renew import restrictions on Burma (P.L. 108-272)	0	0	-11
Total, enacted this session:	188	195	-11
Passed, pending signature: AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (H.R. 4103)	0	0	-32
Entitlements and mandatories: Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	383,884	361,995	n.a.
Total Current Level ¹	1,165,717	1,489,191	1,482,789
Total Budget Resolution	2,012,726	2,010,964	1,454,637
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	28,152
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	847,009	521,773	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2005-2009:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	8,687,742
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	8,638,287
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	49,455

¹ For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include Social Security administrative expenses, which are off-budget. As a result, the current level excludes these items.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law. Numbers may not sum to total because of rounding.

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. GREEN of Texas 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.)

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

(Mr. STRICKLAND 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 gen-

tleman 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.)

DEMOCRATS CHOSE LIBERAL CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise tonight to talk a little bit about the upcoming election, which I understand is on everybody's minds these days.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that we are in a position in America now

that, with 50 States, the Presidential election actually seems to boil down to 12 to 18 States that are still in contention. I guess my home State of Georgia they have decided is probably going to go to Mr. Bush, and your home State of Texas certainly is going to go for Mr. Bush. And then there is other States, like California, that will go for Mr. KERRY. And then, of course, there is North Carolina, which is wide open, despite the fact that Mr. KERRY has chosen a running mate that is from that State.

I think it is interesting as we contrast the two tickets to see what one stands for and the other one stands for. But never before has the Democrat party chosen the first and fourth most liberal Members of the Senate to represent it in the Presidential campaign. It is even more liberal than the disastrous Mondale-Ferraro ticket of 1984.

Here we have, if you think this through a minute, JOHN KERRY scored a 97 percent liberal rating in 2003. He beat out BARBARA BOXER from California. He beat out HILLARY CLINTON. HILLARY CLINTON got an 89 percent liberal rating. And TED KENNEDY. Now, if I was to ask the good folks in Texas, well, who is the most liberal Member of Congress, of the Senate, they are always going to say TED KENNEDY. Well, not so. JOHN KERRY has the 97 percent rating, and KENNEDY is sitting at a mere 88 percent, almost a moderate by JOHN KERRY's standards. And then TOM DASCHLE, a guy we like to curse quite often back home for his stances, he is at 80 percent. So here is JOHN KERRY, 97 percent; TOM DASCHLE, 80 percent.

The Florida Times Union pointed out that, "While KERRY is from the North and EDWARDS is nominally from the South, there is absolutely no philosophical balance whatsoever." I think that is true.

EDWARDS has made a lot of money practicing law, and so he is heavily supported by the trial lawyers. In fact, he has received over \$11 million from law firms, and that was per the KENNEDY campaign. You can find that on www.newsmax.com.

The trial lawyers are weighing in heavily on this race, and for those of us trying to make healthcare more affordable and more accessible, we know what a problem frivolous medical lawsuits are. Yet that seems to be what JOHN EDWARDS has made his money on.

It is interesting what JOHN KERRY said just a couple of months ago, in February, during the campaign. He said, "EDWARDS says he is the only one who can win the South, yet he can't even win his own State." I guess things have changed.

It is interesting also, and I will often say about Mr. Bush, he takes the NASCAR crowd and the mom and dad with 2½ kids and two income families, people who are out there working.

There was an article in the New York Post, actually, I think it was in USA Today and a number of other newspapers, that showed JOHN KERRY's five

houses, and they were five mansions, and it had this picture of JOHN KERRY snowboarding.

I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, how many guys do you know over 60 years old who know how to snowboard? There just are not too many of them. Yet KERRY is shown very proudly snowboarding. I guess since he bought five ski resorts to learn how. He wanted to flaunt it a little bit. But, to me, if you have a guy that age and he knows how to snowboard, he has not only too much money, but he has too much time on his hands as well.

So where did these people, men of the people, make their announcement? In a union hall? Certainly the Democrats get a lot of good support from unions. Did they make it in an African American church? They said over and over again, we want the African American vote. Did they do it in Boston or North Carolina?

No, they made the announcement at Mrs. Kerry's estate in Pennsylvania. Just for those of you who come from middle-class backgrounds, an estate is what rich people call their houses.

It is interesting that JOHN KERRY wanted to get a middle class, regular guy to be his running mate, somebody who was just like us. And I guess in his world, a guy like JOHN EDWARDS, who is worth a mere \$50 million, that is middle-class. After all, when you got a net worth of a billion, what is a guy at \$50 million?

So, these two small town guys got together at the estate at Pennsylvania and they broke tea and crumpets to tell the masses that they were ready to lead the world.

Well, I will say this: I would rather have my President know NASCAR from a church softball game than know Sauvignon Blanc from brie and merlot.

The House Democrats' leadership has announced that one of the Democrat campaigns for the fall will be to repeal the Medicare prescription drug plan. Now, does that make any sense whatsoever? I do not know why Mr. KERRY would want to repeal the Medicare prescription drug bill.

This is the first time in history that low-income seniors are getting up to \$600 in free prescription drugs. It is the first time that seniors are getting about a 50 percent discount, once we get the program going, on their prescription drugs, and I think it is a good first step. Prescription drug coverage is very, very important to the lives of seniors these days.

If you go into almost any audience, almost any age, and you say how many of you in this room have to take or have somebody in your family who has to take five to six to seven to eight pills each and every day to survive, well, about 70 percent of the hands go up. But if you asked that same question to a similar audience back in 1965 when Medicare started, no one would raise his hand, because it was not out there then.

Now we have these miracle drugs, and these miracle drugs help us to live

longer with less pain and do more things, stay active and stay out of hospitals and nursing care. And yet we get from the House Democrat leader that they want to repeal the prescription drug bill. That does not make sense.

But I guess if you are worth \$1 billion like JOHN KERRY, millions of dollars like JOHN EDWARDS, it does not matter to you what the cost of it is. They are not the kinds of people who, when the gas goes from \$1.60 to \$1.72, they do not drive around the next block looking for the best deal so they can pump it themselves.

Several House Democrats have asked that the United Nations monitor the Presidential elections. Now, you know, you could understand that maybe at Tammany Hall, the Chicago machine, or maybe down in Texas when LBJ was running against Coke Stevenson, you might want somebody to come in to monitor the election.

But here we are Americans. We do not need the United Nations to come in and tell us anything. We want to cooperate with the United Nations where it is mutually in the best interests of everyone. But can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, Members of the United States Congress writing Kofi Annan and asking him to send election monitors to the United States of America? I would be embarrassed to go home and, despite my partisanship, try to spin that to a constituency. I think that is just such an insult to people.

We are getting a lot of complaints that we are not spending enough on intelligence, and yet if you look at what our budget has done since 9/11, it spiked. What I see as an appropriator is that a lot of people are getting their budgets I think in many cases over-swelled or overgrown because they are saying it is in security.

But if you look at it, candidate KERRY not only has voted for amendments to cut intelligence, they have often authored amendments to cut intelligence, and that does not quite make sense to me for somebody turning around and saying that we are not spending enough.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go on with this fascinating Democrat Presidential ticket, although I will say, while it is fascinating, it certainly has no diversity of philosophy whatsoever. If we look at where they are on certain things, they voted pretty much down the line together. They opposed many of the Bush initiatives on fighting terrorism, and they opposed Bush initiatives for reducing taxes. They have supported pretty much across the board any kind of pro-abortion legislation. Just to give an example, they both voted against the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. They voted against the full marriage tax penalty relief. They voted against the child tax credit. They voted against fully repealing the death tax, and they both voted against the energy bill, and they both oppose free

trade agreements. Litigation this year in America alone will be \$233 billion, that is 2.23 percent of our entire GDP, yet these are the most pro-trial lawyers candidates that we have ever had run for office.

Mr. KERRY has voted at least six times against banning partial-birth abortion. While on the campaign trail, he skipped a vote on passage of the partial-birth abortion bill. I always feel strongly that when one is in office, one is paid to vote and one should be there for their votes, but he skipped a heck of a lot of them.

He was one of 14 Senators who voted against the Defense of Marriage Act in 1996, which would have banned the Federal recognition of gay marriage and same-sex partners. And in 2003, he said he might eventually support gay marriage if it became publicly acceptable. Well, I guess that is kind of couching his words.

EDWARDS said in response to President Bush's proposed constitutional amendment, I am against the President's constitutional amendment on banning gay marriage.

I am going to skip around. There are a lot of things here. But our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), has actually written something about the qualifications of a Vice President. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has a BA in American history from Hanover College, so he is a bit of a historian. But he looked into what was the average years of experience that Vice Presidents had, and he found out that out of 46 previous Vice Presidents, only three engaged in public service for less than 10 years prior to being elected. One of them was a Secretary of Agriculture during the Great Depression, another was a Governor of Indiana, and another was a war hero who turned Congressman and was offered the mission to Spain by President Pierce. So these guys have all had a lot of experience.

The Democrat nominee JOHN EDWARDS has not served a single term in one Chamber of one branch of our Federal Government. If elected, his 6 years, or 5 at this time, I do not think we could give the guy 6 when he is not there all the time, would represent one of the fewest years of preparations to serve as President of the United States as anybody has ever had. His experience would be 20 percent of the average years of experience of previous Vice Presidents. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has given us a pretty good list.

Now, what is interesting is we are not going to hear much from the media about this. The media is going to ask him such tough questions as: Is it true your dad worked in a mill? Whereas when Dan Quayle was appointed by Mr. Bush Senior, all kinds of questions: Senator, what makes you think you are qualified to become President in the event something unfortunate should happen to Mr. Bush? What is it that would make you qualified? He

spent 12 years in Congress with a special emphasis on national security work, but that was not enough. What executive experience do you have? I once worked in the Governor's office in Indiana, Quayle said. And I would admit, not that much. Reporters asked about Quayle's nonservice in Vietnam. Others asked if Quayle had any connection to the Iran-Contra scandal. Others asked about a lobbyist who apparently donated to a golf trip that he had, even though there was no other connection. That is what they wanted.

Then they asked questions about his money: Senator Quayle, it has been quoted that your net worth is \$20 million, is that correct? And if so, isn't this going to put off the blue color vote and the low-income vote. One reporter said to Mr. Quayle: "Since you don't want the Republican Party to seem like the party for the rich, why pick another millionaire for a running mate?"

All of these I would say, they are fair questions; but it is interesting that the press is not going to ask these questions of the Democrat candidate. We can say liberal media, but of course that would be being redundant.

One would have to say that EDWARDS in 2004 does not measure up to Quayle in 1988. Quayle had 12 years in Congress. He ran for the House in 1976 and won. He was reelected in 1978. He ran for the Senate in 1980, at that time beating Democrat Senator Birch Bayh. He was reelected in 1986, winning 61 percent of the vote which, by the way, was the largest landslide ever in the Indiana Senate race.

For his part, EDWARDS has never run for public office before winning the 1998 North Carolina race, and he only got 51 percent in that. As the 2004 race approached, EDWARDS faced very iffy prospects with reelection; and we know that our colleague, RICHARD BURR, was running for that seat with or without EDWARDS as the incumbent, and all the pollsters and experts said this guy is vulnerable. He has not been home. And as for money, the reporter who asked if Quayle's net worth was \$200 million, he was way off. It turns out that Quayle's net worth at the time was less than \$1 million.

Now, I know that his wife had wealth and I am not sure how the trust reads, so I am not going to say that is just \$1 million versus \$50 million or whatever EDWARDS is worth, but EDWARDS is a very successful trial lawyer who has led the life of Riley, and I think to say that he is just a regular middle-class guy is silly, if nothing else.

EDWARDS' youthful experience and the Vice President's age and demeanor, the two men were not that far apart in age when they were chosen for the job. EDWARDS is 51. CHENEY was 59 when George Bush chose him as his running mate. And if we go on down the list, it is interesting that the questions and the scrutiny that Dan Quayle had to live up to, we are not hearing anything from the folks in the media in terms of EDWARDS, and we hope that we will.

Jumping around a little bit and getting back to KERRY, some of his more outstanding votes of note lately was KERRY voted against the \$87 billion to fund American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that included programs like additional body armor. And, Mr. Speaker, we have been to Iraq and Afghanistan. We know how important that is. We heard lots of complaints by folks, making sure that everybody had all the body armor that they wanted. In fact, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader, tried to make a big issue that we did not have enough body armor going around, and yet it is her party's nominee who voted against it.

And then in 1994, this is very disturbing, right after the first attack on the World Trade Center, this was when Mr. Clinton was President and chose to not do anything, or not do much about it, KERRY had proposed to gut the Select Committee on Intelligence budget by \$6 billion, and that was right after the first attack on the World Trade Center. If we go back to 1990, Mr. KERRY wanted to cut \$10 billion from the defense budget.

The other thing, and I do not have the quote right in front of me, but Mr. LIEBERMAN who ran against Mr. KERRY said that we do not need a flip-flopper. And there is all kinds of evidence of him flip-flopping.

There are some ways, though, a group called the Black Five, and I am not sure what that is, but they came up with a way to decide if you should vote for JOHN KERRY. They said, How do you know for sure, and one way to do it is you could take this test. If you believe that the AIDS virus is spread by the lack of Federal funding, you might want to vote for JOHN KERRY. If you believe that the same school system that cannot teach fourth graders how to read is somehow the best qualified to teach those same kids all about sex, you might want to vote for JOHN KERRY. If you believe that guns in the hands of law-abiding Americans are more of a threat than U.S. nuclear weapons technology in the hands of Chinese Communists, you might want to vote for JOHN KERRY. If you believe there was no art before Federal funding, JOHN KERRY is your guy.

If you believe that global temperatures are less affected by cyclical, documented changes in the Earth's climate and more affected by Americans driving SUVs; I got a laugh when I saw the SUVs. What was it that KERRY was speaking to, Mr. Speaker? Who was the crowd? It was a Detroit group. I think they were auto workers or maybe a chamber of commerce in the Detroit area, and he was saying, I am proud that we have SUVs. And actually, it is interesting, he had a fleet of cars.

I guess if you have five mansions around the world, you need a fleet of cars because, heaven knows, you would not want to rent. By the way, on that subject, his main residence, this man of the people we are talking about, his

main resident in Beacon Hill, Massachusetts, is valued at over \$6.6 million. That is his main residence. I do not know if my colleagues know this story, but one time Mrs. Kerry got some parking tickets for parking over in front of a fire hydrant. Now, what would you do if you were a liberal Democrat? Under that circumstance, you would think, I would pay the fine. In fact, I would send a little more because I believe in government, and I want to help subsidize government. This is a great chance. No. Instead, they simply moved the fire hydrant.

Now, I am telling my colleagues, that is some serious money. When your wife gets a ticket for parking in front of a fire hydrant and you have the fire hydrant moved, you have some money. But that is the approach to government.

They also, though, have a 90-acre family estate near Pittsburgh. That is valued at \$3.7 million. Then they have a ski vacation home in Idaho that is a \$5 million job purchased in 1988, and then there is the waterfront estate in Nantucket Harbor. This beachfront property is valued at about \$9.1 million, and KERRY tools around the sound in his 42-foot power boat that is worth \$695,000. What a guy of the people. I mean, I can just see him driving around in the pickup truck, going down to the little cafeteria down the street and joining the coffee club and talking about how gas prices jumped from \$1.75 to \$1.78, and how that is going to set them back.

□ 2115

And of course here in Washington a 23-room townhouse in Georgetown valued at \$4.7 million, I do not know why the guy wants to move in the White House. That is certainly a cut in lifestyle, although I think it has got a pretty cool plane and your own police force and things he would like.

Getting back to this Blackfive thing, if one is against capital punishment but supports abortion on demand, JOHN KERRY is your guy. If one believes that businesses create oppression and government creates prosperity, JOHN KERRY is your guy. If one believes that hunters do not care about nature but loony activists in Seattle do, JOHN KERRY is your guy. If one believes that self-esteem is more important than actually doing something to earn it, JOHN KERRY is your guy.

There is a number of other tests that this group has, and I might just recommend that people look at www.blackfive.net and just take the test for themselves.

We have been joined, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), and I wanted to yield the floor for him.

And is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) with us? Well, I apologize for overlooking the gentleman. I thought the gentleman just wanted to hear some brilliance and was waiting for the next speaker to give it.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I was listening to the gentleman a little while ago and he was mentioning about how Mr. KERRY tries to portray himself as one of the regular folk and he was talking about how he, frankly, is one of the very privileged folk, I think that kind of explains, though, some of his votes and some of the things that he says after some of his votes.

If the gentleman will recall that he voted against President Bush's tax relief plan in 2001 and also in 2003. By the way, that tax relief plan, i.e., in other words, government taking a little bit less of the people's money, it is not a gift that the government has given, just the government taking a little bit less of people's money, that is the reason why we are finally now in this economic upturn. And, again, they might try to scream and complain, but the bottom line is everybody has had to recognize that, because of that, the economy is doing much better.

But then since it is working and since more people are getting jobs and since over a million jobs have been created in the last year because of the President's leadership, and then they said, well, but the President's tax cuts were tax cuts on the rich. And, Mr. Speaker, again, I am in awe of what I hear up here sometimes. I am new here. This is my first term, and I am sometimes in awe of what I hear up here.

The tax cuts that the President proposed and this Congress passed, Senator KERRY, now, he would know what a tax cut on the rich is, obviously, because he is very wealthy, and nothing wrong with that, but I do not know about the State of Massachusetts. It is a different world. We know that the State of Massachusetts is a different world. It is the State that gave us JOHN KERRY and TED KENNEDY.

But, in Florida, everybody dies. In Florida, eventually everybody dies, and one of the tax cuts that this President supported, proposed and Senator KERRY voted against is the death tax. Again, I do not know about Massachusetts, but in the State of Florida not only the wealthy die.

One of the tax cuts that Senator KERRY voted against, saying now that it is a tax cut on the rich, was the marriage penalty relief. Now, I do not know about other parts of the country, but in the State that I am privileged to represent here in Congress, which is Florida, not only the wealthy get married. Working people get married as well. And yet Senator KERRY voted against it, saying, oh, that is a tax cut on the rich.

He voted against the child tax credit, for example. Now, again, I do not know about the State that he represents, the State where maybe everybody has nine houses that are worth millions of dollars, but in Florida where people work

awfully hard, and I am pretty sure that throughout the country they do, not only do the wealthy get married, not only do the wealthy have children, not only do the wealthy die.

A colleague of ours in Florida said that at least one would think that we could agree that there should be no taxation without respiration, at least, but, no, Senator KERRY believes that that is wrong, that we have to tax people when they get married, we have to tax people if they have children, we have to tax people if they have small businesses, and, yes, we even have to tax people after they are dead, after they are dead. And yet, Mr. Speaker, he keeps saying that those are tax cuts on the rich.

I think maybe the explanation is what the gentleman was saying a little while ago, that he lives in a different place. I do have to admit, though, because I have seen a lot of things and I have heard a lot of things that to my point of view just do not make sense, like these are tax cuts on the rich, these tax cuts that I just mentioned, but maybe it is just a different world. I have to admit, though, that I give Senator KERRY credit, and I have heard this time and time again. One has got to give him credit for something that I, this humble servant, believed was impossible. When Senator KERRY has made TED KENNEDY the conservative senator of Massachusetts and when we look at the rankings, Senator KERRY is even more liberal, even more of an extreme left-winger than Senator Ted Kennedy. I did not think that was possible. Only Senator KERRY has been able to do so.

And he has, by the way, picked a very charming, very eloquent man as his running mate, who is the fourth most liberal Member of the Senate. He could have gone and picked a number of people out there. No, he had to pick somebody that was almost as liberal as himself.

Mr. Speaker, in that sense, the ticket of McGovern and Shriver, not since McGovern has there been a more left-wing extreme point of view put forward by the Democratic ticket as the ticket that is now in front of the American people. And, again, when they voted against repealing the death tax, when they voted to increase the child tax credit, in other words, when they voted against lowering taxes on families for their children, when they voted against the full marriage penalty relief, it goes to show us that, yes, it is absolutely true, hard to believe, that that ticket now is more left-wing and more liberal than even TED KENNEDY. It is hard to believe, but, yes, that ticket is more left-wing, more radical, more liberal, or at least equally to the ticket that McGovern headed in 1972, I believe, before my time, but it is hard to see a more left-wing extremist ticket, except for the one that the Democratic party has put forward.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I wanted to underscore

that. I have some of Mr. EDWARDS' rating groups, and the gentleman has established already that Mr. KERRY is more liberal than Mr. KENNEDY, with a 97 percent liberal rating compared to Mr. KENNEDY's 88 percent. But here was NARL, which is the National Abortion Rights League, they gave Mr. EDWARDS 100 percent for the last 4 years in a row. The National Right to Life has given him a 0. The AFL-CIO pronoun vote, 100 percent for the last 3 years. The Federal Employees Union, 91 percent, then 100 percent, 100 percent.

National Taxpayers Union, Mr. EDWARDS, 22 percent, but that is up from 12 percent 3 years ago; Americans for Tax Reform, 0 percent, down from 5 percent last year; and then Citizens Against Government Waste, 13 percent in terms of being probusiness. The National Federation of Independent Businesses, small businesses, has given Mr. EDWARDS a 0 percent. Privately, if one shows up, they get a 70 percent on their rating, but he has got a 0 percent. U.S. Chamber of Commerce has given Mr. EDWARDS 15 percent.

Why are these important? These are important because these are folks who help job creation, job impact, and if we are interested in jobs, we do not want somebody with a 15 percent U.S. Chamber rating and a 0 percent National Federation of Independent Businesses.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, when one sees that, so he clearly likes raising taxes. He even supported a 50 percent gas tax, per gallon gas tax increase. Now I do not know about the gentleman, but in the State of Florida, gas is relatively expensive right now, and if the people out there think gas is too cheap, no problem, they have got a good person to vote for in November. That is Senator KERRY, who, again, has supported a 50 percent per gallon gas tax increase.

Mr. KINGSTON. And at the same time blocked the energy bill that would have given us more affordable energy in alternative energy sources, fuel cell, hydrogen cell research and a lot of good stuff. He helped block that bill because the travelers did not like it.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. And, again, there are certain things that just boggle the mind. For example, he voted for giving the President authorization to go after Saddam Hussein, to take out Saddam Hussein, and then when our troops are on the field and when they are giving their all, including, unfortunately, their lives to protect our freedoms, to do the job that Senator KERRY himself voted to authorize, then he votes against the \$87 billion to give them the equipment that they need on the field. That is that famous quote when he says, well, "I voted for it before I voted against it."

I guess he must have been embarrassed at his vote, but it gets worse now. There are so many reasons why he is the most extreme liberal left-winger

since McGovern. He proposed gutting the intelligence budget, the intelligence budget by \$6 billion, not long after the first World Trade Center bombing.

And so, again, we see some of these votes, and we just do not understand. How is it possible? We never know where he is today. If we ask him today, he may have changed four or five times, but he clearly supported going into Iraq but then does not support giving our troops the equipment that they need.

Now, that should not surprise us, because years earlier he tried to cut the intelligence budget, to really destroy the intelligence budget, and I have got some quotes of his that are just unbelievable. In the 1997 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1 quote, he said, "Now that the struggle," the Cold War, in other words, "is over, why is it that our vast intelligence apparatus continues to grow?" Excuse me? Why are we spending so much money on intelligence?

Well, we know what happens when we do not prepare, when we are not strong and when we do not have adequate intelligence.

Again, these are things that boggle the mind, and maybe part of the explanation is because he has seven homes. God bless him. I do not have a problem with that, but maybe that is why he thinks that cutting taxes on married people is cutting the tax on the rich. Maybe that is why he thinks when taxes are cut on people who die, estate taxes, that that is cutting taxes on the rich. Maybe that is why he believes that cutting taxes to small business is cutting taxes on the rich. It is not. It is cutting taxes on real American people, and when taxes are cut, we do not give anything. Government is not giving a gift. Government, all it is doing is taking a little bit less of the people's money. Is that wrong? No. It is the right thing to do morally, and it is also helping our economy.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) a minute. He wanted to talk.

Mr. GINGREY. Well, I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Georgia and the gentleman from Savannah for yielding a little time and especially since I was actually not scheduled to be part of this colloquy. I know there are a number of other Members here who want to join in the discussion.

But I was just back in my office doing a little paperwork and catching up on some things and watching C-SPAN, and as the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Florida began to discuss some facts about the presumptive Democratic nominee, Mr. KERRY, that it is important that the American people know I felt compelled to come down and hopefully not take more than 3 or 4 minutes, because there is something that I want my colleagues in this Chamber to know, and hopefully they will share this with their constituents, the American people.

See, there is one thing, only one that I can think of, really, that I share that I have in common with the presumptive Democratic nominee, Mr. KERRY. We both share the same religion. We are both Roman Catholics. And, Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to share with my colleagues. The presumptive Democratic nominee for President, he recently made two very interesting statements. Mr. KERRY, a constant supporter of abortion rights throughout his whole 20-year career in this United States Senate, now says he believes that life actually does begin at the moment of conception.

Let me repeat that. He believes that life actually does begin at the moment of conception.

Nevertheless, Mr. KERRY continues to insist that he is ideologically pro-choice because of his firm belief in "separation of church and State."

Now, I assume Mr. KERRY is referencing the establishment clause of the Constitution, which declares that our government shall establish no State religion and that citizens are free to worship God in the manner of their individual choosing. Indeed, freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

□ 2130

Madam Speaker, the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by our Constitution, so it would seem that JOHN KERRY would, by his own words, believe that life begins at conception, would, through his pro-choice stance, be in direct contrast to the most important guarantee of our charter documents.

Mr. KERRY goes on to say that his Roman Catholic belief that the moment of conception is the same moment life is created, that should not be imposed on those whose faith through other religions do not share that same belief. He should not impose that other on other religions because they may not share that same belief.

Madam Speaker, I wonder, I wonder which particular religion Mr. KERRY is referencing. In my 11th district of Georgia I have attended services at many churches, synagogues, houses of worship of different denominations. All of the religions I have encountered firmly, firmly believe in the sanctity of life which God creates at the moment of conception.

Now, Mr. KERRY recently spoke from Pittsburgh just the other day about giving kids a chance at full citizenship by strengthening Early Start and Head Start. Madam Speaker, the best way to guarantee our youth a chance at full citizenship is by guaranteeing their constitutional unalienable right to life.

Madam Speaker, I would remind Mr. KERRY, the presumptive Democratic Presidential nominee that almost 40 million children since the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision have been denied an Early Start or Head Start. Indeed, they were given no start whatsoever.

So, Madam Speaker, I would hope those who wish to become the President of our Nation would have the courage to stand up for their belief in life at conception regardless of how recently they may have come to this conclusion. Many Presidential hopefuls try to have their cake and eat it too. We have been hearing a lot of that discussion here tonight, and I agree with it; but you absolutely cannot have it both ways on such an important issue as the sanctity of life. And I thank my colleagues for giving me an opportunity to come down and share that with you and with the other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

I am going to talk about that more and more. I think we need to make sure that we understand. How in the world could someone be for life and against life, be for the sanctity of life at conception and be pro-choice? It is incongruous. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for allowing me to share this evening with my colleagues.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for joining us. We have been joined by another physician, member of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), and wanted to point out, Madam Speaker, that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) was a practicing OB-GYN until his election to Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for yielding to me this evening.

I felt compelled to come and talk a little bit about the issues this evening. We have been hearing a lot about the relative preparedness or unpreparedness for the second highest office in this land to which they have been nominated, and that is actually not what I wanted to speak about this evening; but I would rather speak about the experience or the preparation that that individual does have, and that is in his profession as a trial lawyer.

The Wall Street Journal on Thursday of last week in its lead editorial, the last paragraph says, "Our runaway tort system is a genuine problem that is causing economic harm, and far more importantly, it is distorting the cause of justice. American politics typically responds to such problems, but in this case, the power of the tort bar centered on Democratic Senators has blocked even the most modest fixes. If this compromise fails this year, we will know for sure that this issue deserves to be joined until the Presidential campaign."

That is the Wall Street Journal's lead editorial from the end of last week.

As far as the issue of the medical civil justice system or the medical liabilities system in this country, we have had some legislation passed in this House twice in the past year and a half, but the action has been blocked on the other side of the Capitol. And what is the cost, Madam Speaker, what

is the cost of doing nothing in this regard?

Well, between 1994 and 2001, the typical medical liability award increased by 176 percent to \$1 million. That is from "Liability of Medical Malpractice: Issues and Evidence"; Joint Economic Committee, May of 2003.

The National Journal cited in the issue just last week that \$230 billion was the cost to this country of the medical civil justice system last year; and of that \$230 billion, about one-fifth went to compensate patients for actual damages. About an equal amount, about a fifth, a little less than that, 19 percent, was the payment for the trial lawyers' part of that, a fifth went to the insurance companies, and one quarter of that amount went to pay the exploding costs of non-economic damages.

The American Medical Association in its Medical Liability Reform Fact Sheet last year said 60 to \$108 billion per year would be saved in health care costs by placing a reasonable limit on noneconomic damages. Not eliminating them entirely, but placing a reasonable limit. "Defensive medicine is a potentially serious social problem. If fear of liability drives health care providers to administer treatments that do not have worthwhile medical benefits, then the current liability system may generate inefficiencies much larger than the costs of compensating malpractice claimants." This may lead to reductions of 5 to 9 percent in medical expenditures without an increase in the quality of medical care.

The study by McClellan in 1996 in 1996 dollars estimated that \$50 billion dollars a year could be saved in the Medicare system by the elimination of some practices of defensive medicine. There is a significant human impact as well. Doctors are leaving practice, and we are losing that critical human capital that we as citizens of this country and of our States have paid to educate.

There is a perinatologist in my community who left his practice about a year after entering practice because he could no longer afford the six-figure liability premium. He went to work for Perot Systems, a medical information systems consultant; but the fact is, he is not practicing perinatology. The State paid for his education. The State paid for his education in medical school and residency, and now we will never see the benefit of that payment because this individual was driven from his practice by the high cost of the liability insurance.

At Methodist Medical Center in Dallas last year, we lost a neurosurgeon because he could not afford the six-figure liability premium that he was faced with, putting the whole trauma system in the north Texas network at risk.

Madam Speaker, even more importantly than that, the cost of the human capital that is now being extracted on our youngest citizens and citizens as they contemplate what careers to pur-

sue, individuals in undergraduate school and medical school and in high school, look at the medical profession and turn away because of the crisis in medical liability, and it is so unnecessary. Some reasonable fixes have been proposed by this House. They have been blocked on the other side of the Capitol; and, unfortunately, one of the individuals who is at the root of blocking those commonsense reform is now the nominee for the second highest office in this land.

So I would say I am not so much concerned about the experience that he lacks in the administrative side of the government. I am far more concerned about the type of experience he brings from the plaintiffs' bar. I do not believe that this issue can get a fair hearing with that individual sitting in the second highest office of the land.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us tonight and also for giving your perspective. I wanted to ask the doctor a few questions, if I could, before he leaves. How long did the gentleman practice medicine?

Mr. BURGESS. For 25 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. What was your specialty?

Mr. BURGESS. Obstetrics and gynecology.

Mr. KINGSTON. In that field, how big is the problem of malpractice as you the gentleman know it firsthand?

Mr. BURGESS. It is causing doctors to leave the practice of medicine. There is no question about it. I saw it myself.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and I are perhaps the poster children for that. We left our practices and came to the relative safety of the United States Congress to avoid the pernicious medical liability climate. In south Texas along the Rio Grande Valley, it is a crisis of epic proportions. And until we passed some State reforms this past year, in September of last year, doctors were leaving the State in significant numbers. Malpractice insurers were leaving the State. We had gone from 17 insurers to four; and the policies were very, very restricted that were being written.

Since we put in some very, very basic reforms, some very, very basic curtailments of noneconomic damages, the insurers in the State of Texas have now increased to 12, insurance prices have come down significantly. The crisis has been adverted to some degree in Texas, but it remains a nationwide problem.

Mr. KINGSTON. As the gentleman talks to physicians, if someone said, name the top three problems physicians are faced with right now, would malpractice be one of them?

Mr. BURGESS. Certainly that would be at the top of the list. Reimbursement rates from HMOs is going to be second. The slow rate of payment from insurance companies and HMOs would probably rank as third.

Mr. KINGSTON. So unless we address the frivolous medical liability suits in

our country, the cost of medicine will skyrocket and the availability is going to shrink?

Mr. BURGESS. I think access is going to be severely, severely restricted. A woman who is the head of the Columbia University residency program, an OB-GYN, Columbia University has a very good residency program, perhaps second only to Parkland Hospital where I did my residency, this individual told me that currently they were accepting people into their residency program that 5 years ago they would not have even interviewed. That is, the quality of applicant has dropped off so significantly because people simply fear this issue. They see no reason to enter a life where there is going to be this much uncertainty. So it is really extracting a high toll as far as the availability of our future providers, not just what is happening right now, but what is happening for our children and our children's children.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman. If we have the Edwards-Kerry trial lawyer ticket, we probably will not have any serious medical liability reform, would we?

Mr. BURGESS. That is my firm belief as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I think we had a good discussion here today. I notice my friends on the other side of the aisle are here chomping at the bit and I know are eagerly awaiting freedom of speech, equal time; and my friend from California is grabbing the mike right now for a discussion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). The Chair will remind all Members to refrain from improper references to individual Senators. While references to Members in their capacity as presumptive nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency are not prohibited, references to other Members of the Senate must be consistent with clause 1 of rule XVII.

WHO IS IN CONTROL?

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to say to my friend from Georgia, when he is talking about past Vice President Dan Quayle, what he needed to do was know how to spell potato.

Madam Speaker, last week President Bush was asked what distinguishes Vice President DICK CHENEY from Senator JOHN EDWARDS, JOHN KERRY's Vice Presidential running mate. Mr. Bush's haughty reply was, "DICK CHENEY can be President."

This implied criticism of Senator EDWARDS, who happens to sit on the prominent Senate Intelligence Committee. And this is quite laughable be-

cause Senator EDWARDS actually has more experience than George W. Bush did at the time he ran for office in the year 2000.

The appalling part of this comment is that not only could DICK CHENEY be President, he has performed the functions of the Presidency. Since day one, DICK CHENEY has wheeled, dealt and cajoled his way to accomplish his dangerous, self-serving, neo-conservative agenda.

DICK CHENEY has chomped at the bit to finish the job he started in 1991 as Secretary of Defense when the United States first went to war with Iraq. In the year 2003 when President Bush needed to make the case for going to war with Iraq, it was DICK CHENEY who met with the intelligence analysts at the CIA to determine whether Iraq possessed nuclear weapons.

Vice President CHENEY claims that he did not strong-arm these analysts into adopting his view that Iraq was in possession of weapons of mass destruction. Despite what I am sure were CHENEY's best and most benevolent intentions, the Vice President of the United States probably registered quite a bit of influence with a bunch of career CIA analysts who were likely to give him the evidence he wanted, whether it was true or not. And it was Vice President CHENEY, not President Bush, the Commander in Chief, who gave the unsuccessful order to shoot down the hijacked planes on September 11. At a time when America was being attacked, it was Vice President CHENEY who made the important decisions.

By now this pattern should be quite clear. Vice President CHENEY does the real work of the administration, making the key decisions in our times of greatest need.

□ 2145

When George Bush says that DICK CHENEY can be President, he is right, but that says more about President Bush's own failure of leadership than it says anything about Vice President CHENEY's abilities.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. They deserve better than a man-behind-the-man presidency. Senator JOHN EDWARDS will not be the kind of Vice President who will falsify intelligence for the purposes of sending our young men and women to war. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, he knows better.

We need leaders who will not abdicate the Constitution in the name of political opportunism, a Presidential team that will pursue smarter policies than those of the current administration.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, the SMART security resolution, which provides a much smarter national security platform than the one we currently have. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism. SMART security means confronting the threat of terrorism not by creating more terrorism, as the

Bush administration has done in Iraq, but by striking at the very heart of the real terror networks.

SMART would cut off financing for terrorist groups and would break up of their organizations around the world, engaging the international community in this process, the same international community the Bush administration so callously disregarded in its march to war.

SMART security provides a better path for America than the one we are currently on. Could DICK CHENEY be President? Sure, if you do not mind the fact that the real President is asleep at the wheel, but JOHN EDWARDS, who could step in for JOHN KERRY on a moment's notice, will not be a shadow President because JOHN KERRY will lead this country on a truly smart path.

The voters will decide in November what they want: an administration that unnecessarily sent American troops into a war that has cost the lives of thousands, or a Kerry-Edwards administration that will be smart about America's national security.

ELECTIONS, NOT FEAR, MAKE AMERICA STRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, elections, not fear, make America strong.

I just returned this afternoon from my district. All last weekend, everywhere I went in Seattle people kept asking me the same question, are they really going to take away our election? Now, I did not go to the secret briefing that they had last week. It is my practice and my policy not to go to secret briefings.

The day after the briefing, however, there was a stunning administration press conference revealing that the Department of Homeland Security thinks we should all be more afraid but that things are not bad enough to raise the terror alert level from yellow, and we should all be vigilant, but not about anything specific.

Now, that secret meeting that they had the day before had everybody's mouth zipped shut in this place. Then they go out on the street and say what they told us not to talk about; and, by the way, we need to figure out how to legally delay the election, just in case. That was the bottom line, what they were talking about. The homeland security spokesman referred to this as an effort "to determine what steps need to be taken to secure the election." Please, folks, could we not at least avoid the Orwellian language?

Now we have got the people flooded with fear, and the conspiracy theorists are having a field day. It is everywhere, in all the clips today in the paper, everywhere all across the country just

what was going on in my district. I did not know where it came from, but when I got back to Washington and read what was going on nationwide, it is everywhere.

How does this contribute to our national security? How does it do anything except keep everybody off balance and crazy?

This ratcheting up the level of alarm is always followed by a pause though there is no change in the evidence or lack of evidence of a terrorists' ill-intentions and the relaxation of the tension is always followed by another call to fear.

There really are people out in the world who want to hurt us. Let us direct our attention to them. Let us work on the problem, instead of working on the nerves of the American people.

I do not want to anticipate that the Department of Homeland Security is going to fail. I want the Department to do everything possible to make us and our elections safe.

So I have some advice for the Department of Homeland Security, Madam Speaker. Stick to your knitting; try to keep the homeland secure; analyze the chatter; do not chatter yourself; do not add to the noise; do your job; do not stir up fear.

We are a vast and strong Nation. For the people in our government to be saying that if there is a terrorist event we will get rid of the election, excuse me? They do not do that in India. They do not do that in Germany. They do not do that in any country. You are acting like one event somewhere in this country is going to give the President the right to call off the election. Absolutely nonsense.

We got through the British burning the White House and the Capitol, this very building was burned to the ground in the War of 1812, without suspending an election. We got through the Civil War without suspending an election. You can go downstairs and see pictures of troops bivouacked on the campus of the Capitol, but we had an election in 1864. Some people thought it should be delayed, but it went right ahead. In a democracy you do not have to be afraid, and we will get through the election of 2004.

The Presidents who made these decisions to go ahead with the election, despite threats, were fighting ground wars right here in D.C. and in its suburbs, not 8,000 miles away. They had it right on their doorstep, but President Madison, who wrote most of the Constitution, and President Lincoln, who saved the Union, believed in this country and in its people. They believed that people would persevere and prevail, and that is what I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Members of this body and our administration to repudiate this fear mongering, the rumor generating, the chatter about delaying our elections. What kind of nonsense is that for the leadership in this country to be even talking about? It insults our

intelligence. It distracts us. It harms our country. It is ill-befitting of this American democracy that we are all so proud of.

NORTH CAROLINA'S FAVORITE SON, JOHN EDWARDS, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL TICKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, this evening I rise with several of my colleagues and a number from my North Carolina delegation to talk about our favorite son, JOHN EDWARDS, as well as our ticket.

JOHN EDWARDS is from a little place in Moore County called Robbins, North Carolina. He currently resides in our State capital of Raleigh.

I normally do not respond to things some people say on the floor, and I find it a bit of interest earlier that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle knew so much about him, they wanted to quote from the Wall Street Journal. There are a few people in North Carolina who read the Wall Street Journal, but if he really wants to know about JOHN EDWARDS, I would suggest he read the Raleigh News and Observer, probably the Charlotte Observer or a lot of our weekly papers, and he would find a lot out about JOHN EDWARDS.

If he had been in Raleigh on Saturday, he would have had the opportunity to see about 20,000 people standing in the hot July sun, over 90 degrees for 4 hours, to welcome home JOHN EDWARDS and Presidential nominee JOHN KERRY and their wives Elizabeth and Teresa to Raleigh, North Carolina. It was a wonderful celebration of the first North Carolinian on the Presidential ticket in modern times.

I will have more to say about this in just a moment, but first I want to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), for some comments.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be here tonight. I did not think I would be pleased to be here. In my office earlier, I was regretting greatly having agreed last week to come down tonight as I saw the time slip away and as I was, instead of dinner, eating the complimentary North Carolina peanuts that we pass out to our visitors, wondering when, if ever, tonight I would get dinner.

Then I heard the speeches of a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and by others on the same topic but from a different perspective, and I felt a new energy and a new enthusiasm for our task tonight, and I would like to address some of the questions that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the others asked about JOHN EDWARDS.

First, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) asked why it was that JOHN EDWARDS did not have to answer any of the insulting questions that were asked of Dan Quayle when the first President Bush asked him to run as Vice President in 1988, and I think that there is a simple answer to that.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said that Dan Quayle had been in Congress for 12 years, JOHN EDWARDS in the Congress for only six, but JOHN EDWARDS had not been asked why he was qualified to be President when that question was put very pointedly to Mr. Quayle. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said he believed it must be because of the liberal media. I think there is a different explanation.

JOHN EDWARDS is smart. JOHN EDWARDS is smart. Everyone knows he is smart. Everyone who has spent any time around him knows that. He is plenty smart enough to be Vice President. He is plenty smart enough to be President.

Second, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and all the others said that this is a ticket of two crazy liberals, wild-eyed crazy liberals, out of step with North Carolina or even, they suggested, with Massachusetts, and I just wish they would get their story straight.

JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS are the Huck Finns of American politics because they got to attend their own political funeral. In December of last year and early January, they appeared to be politically dead. Their campaigns were not going anywhere. The former governor of Vermont, Howard Dean, appeared to be walking away with the Democratic nomination. A respected political reporter here, Stuart Rothenberg, wrote a column that said, "It ain't over till it's over, but it's over." Howard Dean was assumed to be the nominee.

So all the right-wing commentators began talking about how the Democrats were going to nominate a crazy liberal in Howard Dean; and, to establish that contrast, they said the Democrats were rejecting sensible, thoughtful, moderate candidates like JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. Things did not go according to their script, and now the ticket is JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS, and those same thoughtful, sensible, moderate folks that just a few months ago they were praising, they now are tarring with the same brush that they tarred Howard Dean.

Also, they need to get their story straight because just last week, in the hours immediately after JOHN KERRY had announced that he had asked JOHN EDWARDS to run on the ticket with him, the first response from the Bush-Cheney campaign was a 26-page e-mail that outlined all of these differences, all these differences between KERRY and EDWARDS, they just had nothing in common, and it just showed how flagrantly political JOHN KERRY was to have asked someone with whom he

agreed so little to run as Vice President with him.

□ 2200

Very quickly they abandoned that. Now they say they are just alike. There is absolutely no balance to this ticket; they are exactly alike. The same voting record. They are two peas in a left-wing pod. Again, their story would have a little more credibility if they would stick with it for just a little while.

In fact, both JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY are moderate in the best sense, not in some voting record and how they have reacted in the last 2 years to take-it-or-leave-it propositions, bills that have not been put to them to vote "yes" or "no," bills that have not been compromised an iota. That is not the test of their moderation. It is their willingness to compromise, to try to find common ground, to try to find sensible solutions, to listen to everyone involved in the political debate, to listen respectfully, to respect their views and concerns, and to listen carefully because they might actually learn something. Would that not be refreshing to have in a President and Vice President?

I was also startled to hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY were out of touch and criticized them so sternly for being wealthy, for being rich. This is a party that treats the richest folks like rock stars. They are almost embarrassing in their fawning over rich folks. And the richer the folks are, the more fawning they are, the more unctuous they are around them. But that is not the point. The point is not the success JOHN EDWARDS has had.

Yes, JOHN EDWARDS has been very, very successful. We used to call that the American Dream. The point is where he started out and what he learned from that. JOHN EDWARDS, and I know they are tired of hearing the story of his being the son of a mill worker, but it is true and it is important. He understands what most folks' lives are like because that is the kind of life he lived. His father worked in the mill, his mother worked in the post office, as my father worked in the post office.

JOHN EDWARDS' life was like most Americans' lives. He had to depend on the public schools to get ahead, to have opportunities for him. Wallace and Bobbi Edwards, JOHN EDWARDS' parents, could not have sent JOHN EDWARDS to some expensive New England boarding school. He had to go to the public schools. And JOHN EDWARDS understands to the depth of his soul the importance of public education for middle-class Americans, the importance of public education in creating opportunities for ordinary Americans.

JOHN EDWARDS never got into any school on anything but his own merit. He never got into any college, he did not get into law school because of who

his daddy was. He got in because he earned his way. He has earned his way his entire life. He has never had anything given to him, and he will understand the lives of ordinary Americans because of that.

They have talked about his role as a trial lawyer and the money that he made and how that now puts him out of touch. I can tell you what a trial lawyer does. The suggestion that he handled frivolous cases and made a fortune off that is ridiculous. He took the cases that had merit. He took the cases where people had been harmed because someone had not done what they should have done.

JOHN EDWARDS had to explain to juries how people who had suffered a terrible injury, how their lives had changed. He had to explain what their life was like before the injury, what their hopes were, what their aspirations, what they wanted their future to be like; and then he had to explain to the jury how that had changed and what their life was like after the terrible injury that they had suffered. And he had to explain the lives of many different people from many different walks of life.

I can tell you this, before you explain something to a jury, you have to understand it yourself. He was past master at understanding intellectually and at the pit of his stomach what peoples' lives were like, the lives they led and how their lives changed. And that would be a wonderful asset to have as a President or as a Vice President.

Finally, I want to address the lack of experience, the issue that they raise. That was, of course, part of the Dan Quayle debate as well. I was very startled to hear the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) describe that JOHN EDWARDS had had less than 10 years of, his phrase was, public service, which I take to mean years in a political office. It was just 10 years ago that the members of the majority party campaigned for term limits. They characterized public service as career politicians. Now, 10 years later, they say that 6 years in political office is entirely too little experience, too little time in public life.

I think that the debate tonight of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) reminds us all how out of touch the majority party has become in 10 years and how if we want to have leadership in touch with the lives of ordinary Americans we need to change our leadership.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for joining us.

When we talk about this ticket, and certainly JOHN and his wife, Elizabeth, my North Carolina neighbors and all of our colleagues in North Carolina, their neighbors, and people from all walks of life are just thrilled to see this ticket, to see JOHN EDWARDS and Elizabeth really rise to national prominence, because they truly are one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn and yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), for his comments on this ticket.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for taking out this Special Order and giving us a chance to talk about a man whom we know very well and whom we know is prepared to serve this country very well.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), for listening so carefully to the preceding hour and the kinds of statements that were made on this floor. There is one that I thought was particularly striking, and I just want to check my recollection of this, if I might.

The gentleman from Georgia seemed to come over here and really challenge JOHN KERRY's faithfulness as a Catholic. That is what I heard him saying. That is extraordinary. That is extraordinary.

He also, in the process, restated the establishment clause of the Constitution. He said the first amendment prohibits the establishment of a State religion. No, the first amendment prohibits the establishment by the State of religion. And I would not pretend for a moment that it is always a simple thing to balance that establishment clause and the free exercise clause and understand how it can be applied in specific cases, but I would think one thing it means is that one in our country and under our form of government is not to take a theological interpretation, let us say of when life begins and to make that the law of the land.

There are many ways that our faith informs our politics, and that is true of JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. It is true of the present President and Vice President, and we honor that. The wellsprings of political motivation and political values run very deep, and for most of us that involves our religious beliefs and our religious backgrounds. That is very different from saying, though, that we enact specific religious precepts as the law of the land; that we convert those into civil law when there is not widespread consensus on those precepts, as there came to be in the case, for example, of civil rights, and many other religiously grounded values. But where there is not that kind of broad consensus, over the years we have concluded it is best to leave conscience free. It is best to leave the individual and the collective expression of conscience free.

The gentleman from Georgia seemed to think that Mr. KERRY was being less than faithful because he was refusing to make that transition from a religious precept to the law of the land. And I wonder, where does that stop? Where does that stop? Where do you draw the line? Are there any limits to transforming religious precepts into civil law? Is there anyplace you draw the line, anything you would be willing to define as the establishment of religion?

No, there is great wisdom in that founding document, our Constitution. The State is not to establish religion. The State is not to interfere with the free exercise of religion. And I would suggest we would all do well to honor those precepts and to be very, very cautious in coming on this floor or going anywhere else and labeling a person unfaithful to his religious tradition because he happens to disagree with the interpretation of where these constitutional precepts apply.

I did not mean to start this way, Mr. Speaker, but the preceding hour was so extraordinary in some of the charges made and in some of the claims made that I felt I would add my contribution to what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) very ably lined out.

The gentleman from the second district will remember very well when JOHN EDWARDS first came to the U.S. Senate, and in that first year we had a serious test of our ability to deliver for North Carolina and to collaborate in the interest of our State a challenge that came in the form of a hurricane and a flood named Floyd. And that was a test for all of us, but it was particularly a test for our new Senator; and that is where I got to know JOHN EDWARDS best and came to appreciate the kind of energy and dedication to duty that he exemplifies and his effectiveness. We did get a great deal of support for our State, relief for our State; and JOHN EDWARDS was a very valuable leading member of the team.

We also know him for his leadership on many domestic issues. He is probably best known as the leader in the Senate, along with Senator JOHN MCCAIN from the other side of the aisle, of the fight for a Patients' Bill of Rights. Very, very effective legislative effort. So JOHN EDWARDS is well-known as a legislator who has looked out for North Carolina and who has looked out for the people of this country.

But in the few minutes I have tonight, I want to turn to another aspect of JOHN'S leadership and one that, again, our friends on the other side of the aisle seemed determined to denigrate, and that is his experience and his leadership in national security and in foreign affairs. Some have questioned that. But it is actually an important question to ask. Does a candidate for President or Vice president have credible experience and knowledge in foreign affairs, in security matters; and does he bring that to the table as he asks the American people to support him?

Let me just mention a number of aspects of JOHN EDWARDS' experience in terrorism and national security. On many occasions Senator EDWARDS has transformed key anti-terrorist proposals into law. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator EDWARDS has been an active leader on important issues related to national security, with particular focus on homeland security, intelligence re-

form, military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and U.S.-European relations.

For example, the Biological and Chemical Weapons Preparedness Act. This bill, introduced by Senator EDWARDS, along with Senator HAGEL, Republican of Nebraska, establishes a coordinated national plan for responding to biological and chemical weapons attacks and directs States to develop plans for dealing with such attacks. This was not just a proposal. Major provisions of this bill have been passed by the Senate in the Bioterrorism Preparedness Act.

The Airport and Seaport Terrorism Prevention Act. This legislation specified the use of new identification technologies to screen airport employees. Parts of that proposal were passed by the Senate and signed into law.

The Cyber Terrorism Preparedness Act. The Cyber Security Research and Education Act. These bills strengthen our Nation's preparedness and ability to ward off a cyberattack by terrorists. Parts of that bill were passed by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

The Name Matching For Enforcement and Security Act. Senator EDWARDS introduced legislation to improve the weak capacity of anti-terrorist watch lists and databases to match up variants of foreign names. This legislation was incorporated into the Border Security Act of 2002.

JOHN EDWARDS has been part of a working group of Senators focused on terrorism before 9/11. Before 9/11. In the summer of 2001, JOHN EDWARDS joined a working group of Senators from the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Armed Services who focused on the growing terrorist threat and considered possible responses. Many of these issues, many of these ideas, such as the mandatory sharing of intelligence between CIA and FBI and other agencies, and the training of Federal, State and local law enforcement officers to recognize and communicate critical intelligence information, these ideas were later implemented in legislation passed after September 11.

JOHN EDWARDS has met extensively with leaders around the globe, traveling in the Middle East, Asia and the gulf states, and Europe. He has wide exposure and wide experience internationally. As several of my colleagues have said, far, far more experience and exposure than our present President had when he was nominated. Present President had very, very limited international exposure, and actually seemed proud of that fact.

JOHN EDWARDS has been a member of the joint committee investigating the September 11 attacks. He has focused in on intelligence failures. He served as a member of the joint House-Senate panel investigating those attacks during the inquiry. He developed particular expertise on the shortcomings

of the FBI's intelligence-gathering efforts. He developed relationships with a broad range of experts specializing in intelligence and national security policy, law enforcement, and civil liberties, as well as receiving detailed briefings from the FBI and the director of the British Security Service.

Fourthly, JOHN EDWARDS has played a leading role in post-conflict planning legislation. He played a leading role in improving America's ability to ensure that post-conflict states, like Afghanistan and Iraq, can address security challenges and humanitarian needs and political development.

□ 2215

In 2003 Senator EDWARDS introduced the bipartisan Winning the Peace Act that outlined major reforms to enhance the government's capability to conduct post-conflict reconstruction. And then, finally, JOHN EDWARDS has worked tirelessly to improve our military. As the Senator from North Carolina, he represents Fort Bragg, the world's largest army complex, as well as the headquarters of the Marine Corps Antiterrorism Task Force. He has been active in the effort to improve the quality of life for all who serve in the military and to reach out to military families.

Madam Speaker, others want to speak. I am going to stop with that. I hope, though, that it is evident; and one reason I have mentioned all these various enactments and all these various initiatives is to underscore the point that these are not just empty claims. These are documented claims. This is a record for all to see. This is a Senator who, in his term in the Senate, has been deeply involved in national security and foreign policy issues. He has developed expertise. He has developed a network of people that he works with. He has put forward creative proposals, many of which have been enacted into law. It is an area where he has invested a great deal and where he is prepared to serve.

And I thank the gentleman for giving us all a chance to testify to our knowledge of JOHN EDWARDS's good work and our support for his present effort.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He certainly has represented the fourth district and part of the district that I had the privilege of having for a while and part of the district that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) has. He certainly knows what it takes to be a good legislator, and I appreciate his comments on that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for his comments as well. I thank him for joining us this evening.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) as we talk about the Vice Presidential candidate, JOHN EDWARDS, our friend.

JOHN EDWARDS is a man of distinction, of dedication, and of determination. He has been distinct in all that he

has undertaken. Distinguished personally, professionally, and politically. In everything that he has tackled, he has gone at it with integrity and with the utmost sincerity and authenticity to show that his heart, his mind, and his whole being is engaged. When he puts himself into it, he does it all the way in the best and in the most distinguished way possible.

He is dedicated. He is dedicated not only to the job at hand but dedicated to the people he serves. In fact, that is the hallmark of JOHN's life. He has always cared about people, shown that interest, and gone the extra mile to care for people whether they were in his hometown where he grew up in Robbins, North Carolina, whether it was the people he served and worked with when he was practicing law, or whether it is the people now who have served in North Carolina and that he, indeed, serves and will serve in our entire Nation.

And he is determined. He is determined to provide opportunities for all so that no one is left behind but that all have an equal chance to succeed in life, and this has been evidence in his life. His extraordinary vision will help lift America to a better and brighter tomorrow. Whether we are talking about the farmers to the factory workers, from health care to homeownership, from childhood to college, from the armed services to agriculture, from the environment to energy, from fighting crime to fighting terrorism, in every one of these areas, Senator EDWARDS has distinguished himself, shown his dedication, and lived out his determination.

In particular, when we talk about farmers, being a member, as I know the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is, as we serve together on the House Committee on Agriculture, we know that Senator EDWARDS's commitment to helping our farmers, too often the forgotten ones in today's society, but yet we know if we go over to the Library of Congress and walk into that great hall and look at all the disciplines of learning and science and engineering and literature, what is listed first? And they are not in alphabetical order, necessarily. What is listed first is agriculture. The great tillers of the soil and tillers of civilization, as Noah Webster once said.

And JOHN EDWARDS understands the needs of rural America. Having grown up in a small town, he understands small-town needs, small business, and the understanding of what it means to be able to try to make a living when economic circumstances are not the best. He spent time in rural America and in rural communities. He spent time on the farms and in the factories and in the rural health clinics and in the rural hospitals that I have spent time with myself and in the rural public school system such as the one we have in Robinson County, my home county, where we have spent time there together looking at students'

needs and spending time with students and administrators and parents.

JOHN EDWARDS also understands, as was mentioned a moment ago by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and I know, both representing Fort Bragg, that he understands our military. In fact, one of the first bills he introduced was to help with the pay raise for our military and to also offer better health care for our military. JOHN EDWARDS understands these practical needs, and he exhibits and lives the values of faith and family and freedom.

JOHN EDWARDS is a man of faith. In fact, not only has he been involved in the Senate Prayer Breakfast, which is nondenominational and bipartisan, but, in fact, he was co-chairman of the National Prayer Breakfast just a few years ago here in Washington. And we know the great importance that that has played historically in this Nation that every President since President Eisenhower, of both parties, has participated in. JOHN is a man of faith, and that is reflected in his passion for people and in the high integrity and ideals that he upholds and the way he conducts himself. He lives his faith and does not just talk about it.

JOHN EDWARDS is a man that does not have a shrill tone or speak with bombastic language or unacceptable language, but instead his message is plain. His message is positive. His message is powerful. His message is persuasive. And that is what has won the hearts and minds of so many people who have known him through the years. He will make sure that rural America, as well as urban and suburban America, will not be forgotten.

It says in the Old Testament that "Where there is no vision, the people perish." It has been evident in JOHN EDWARDS's life that he has always had vision. He has seen far beyond even what other people said he could not do, and he has helped take not only many people that he has served, our State but now our Nation, to the future. JOHN EDWARDS is that kind of leader, that kind of man that will help shape a vision for America.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for his comments. Certainly having come from rural eastern North Carolina, he understands what he is talking about and understands our friend JOHN EDWARDS.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), which really happens to be the State where our Vice Presidential nominee was born. We are just grateful his parents decided to come to North Carolina so he could be reared there and get an education and make his living there. But we are happy to have the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) with us this evening to share a few comments about our friend JOHN EDWARDS on our ticket with JOHN KERRY.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to come to the well tonight and to speak on behalf of one of our Nation's most promising leaders. I know that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) has spoken about his relationship with Senator EDWARDS. We have heard from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE); and they have talked about the experiences they have had with him as well as his record here in this city in our other body.

I was asked the other day by a friend why was it that I thought that JOHN EDWARDS was so optimistic about the future of this country when all the headlines around us seem to indicate something else. I said to him JOHN EDWARDS was born in a little town not far from the town where I was born, Sumter. I was born in Sumter. He was born in Seneca. Geographically it is somewhat of a distance apart, but he was born and reared in a value system that I am very familiar with. A value system that is grounded in his faith which can best be described by the words found in the Book of Hebrews: "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." I think that JOHN EDWARDS is optimistic about the future of this country because he has that kind of faith that comes out of a value system that tells us all that, as was said earlier, "where there is no vision, the people perish." He has a vision for the future of this country, and he has expressed that vision time and time again throughout this Nation.

I heard it asked earlier what was the difference between JOHN EDWARDS and Dan Quayle. The difference is very stark. JOHN EDWARDS went before the American people. He laid out his life's history. He laid out his vision for the future. He told the people of this country where he would like to see us go, and he did so in such a way that exudes enthusiasm and optimism, and he endeared himself to the people of this Nation, and of course that is the difference. People got to know him. People got to see him. And people tell me that even when they did not vote for him because they may have thought someone else would make the better candidate, they really were moved by him. And today he is a part of what I consider to be one of the most promising teams of leaders this country has ever produced.

I want to close my comments tonight by dealing with an issue that I hear so much about: this issue of liberal versus conservative. In that little town of Sumter where I grew up, I was born and raised in the parsonage. My father was a fundamentalist minister who taught me in my early years that there are times when it is good to be conservative. He taught me that if I earn a

dollar, I ought to be able to save a nickle. He taught me that when I leave the room, I turn out the lights, I conserve energy. But on Sunday mornings after his sermon, he never asked his congregation to give conservatively. He always asked them to give liberally.

So I grew up thinking that it is good to be conservative at times, and it is good to be liberal at times. What life is all about is finding the balance that will make us all better for having lived it.

We see that balance in JOHN EDWARDS, and as we go forward with this campaign, I think the American people will see that balance in JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY and will entrust the leadership of this Nation to that team that I am sure will make us all proud and bring back the dignity and respect that this Nation has always enjoyed.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate being here.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his kind comments. And he is absolutely right. Elections are about the future, and this election certainly is about our future and the kind of balance we have. JOHN KERRY had the good sense to reach down and choose a man who really the people had already had a chance to see. And I thought the gentleman's comments were absolutely on target with that because never before have we had a candidate that our Presidential nominee reached down and chose as Vice President that they already had a chance to have a shake-down run at the level this one has.

I am also glad the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has joined us. It is great to have someone comment and join this group tonight. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me. And I noticed I guess I am the only Northerner here tonight. Everyone else has been either from South Carolina or North Carolina.

□ 2230

But I have to say when I listened to the other side of the aisle, to the Republicans this evening, criticize our candidates for president and vice president, I could not help but come down here and say a few words, because I have watched both of these Senators who are now our presidential and vice presidential candidates on the Democratic side, and I have been very impressed with them.

I really resented, I do not like to use the word, but I resented the fact that our Republican colleagues used all these labels, liberal versus conservative, rich versus poor, because I know when I listen to Senator EDWARDS and Senator KERRY, they are not looking at things that way, whether somebody is rich, or what somebody's ideology is. They are just looking at it practically. And I have watched what they said.

I particularly want to pay notice of Senator EDWARDS tonight, because he

is the newest person on the ticket and he is always looking at things from a practical point of view. The reason that he advocates change in the White House, and the reason I advocate change, and I think all of us do, is because we just do not like the practical impact of the policies of President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, particularly as it affects the little guy. Because when I listen to Senator EDWARDS, he is always talking about the little guy.

If you look at what happened over the last 4 years under President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, it is the middle-class, it is the little guy that has been hurt, whether it is gas prices or it is healthcare costs or it is education costs, or the fact that over the last 4 years we have had a loss of over 2 million jobs and the jobs that are now being created are not as good as the ones lost. This is what our Democratic candidates are all about.

The ultimate irony, I have to comment a little bit on some of the comments made about Senator EDWARDS being wealthy. He is wealthy, there is no question about that. But here is a guy who grew up in a small town, it has already been described, born in a small town in South Carolina, raised in a small town in North Carolina, from a very modest family. I have a little bit of his biography here.

His father Wallace worked in the textile mills for 36 years. His mother Bobbie ran a shop and worked at the post office. He worked alongside his father in the mill. He was the first person in his family to attend college.

This is a self-made man. This is a guy who went to a state university, North Carolina State University, graduated as undergraduate, then went for his law degree, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, a very good school, but also a public state university. He is self-made.

This is the very thing the Republicans keep talking about. They always use the example of Abe Lincoln, born in a log cabin and became president of the United States. Well, this is what we have here. This is not some guy who was born wealthy and was given everything. He had to work for it. That is what it is all about.

Then when I listened to some of these statements about the fact that he was a trial lawyer and how bad that was, well, you know, let us not put labels on people. I am sure there are some trial lawyers that are bad, but there are a lot of trial lawyers that are good. It depends on what you do.

The fact of the matter is that when I listened to, I think it was the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is a physician from Texas, a Republican, who got up and started criticizing EDWARDS because he was a trial lawyer, am I to assume that everybody who is a physician is good and everybody who is a lawyer is bad? Is that what we have come to now, this sort of divisive element in looking at things? Well, it is just ridiculous.

If you look at EDWARDS' background, he was always fighting for the little guy. I just want to give you a couple of these cases, because I heard the gentleman from Texas, the Republican, talk about what is fair. Well, it is not fair if there are people who are injured and they do not have some way to redress their grievances.

This is an example. This is a very good example. I wanted to use one of the cases that EDWARDS tried. It is Jennifer Campbell, who suffered severe brain damage because of a doctor's mistake and the hospital's complacency.

EDWARDS represented Jennifer Campbell, who was born in April of 1979 with severe brain damage because of medical malpractice on the part of her mother's doctor and hospital. Despite the clear signs of fetal distress during labor, the doctor failed to deliver the baby by C-section and the hospital's nurses failed to help Jennifer by reporting the doctor's conduct up through the hospital's chain of command.

Now, am I to assume that in that case the doctor did the right thing and the doctor was the good guy, and the lawyer, in this case JOHN EDWARDS, who defended Jennifer Campbell who suffered from severe brain damage should not have had somebody to try her case, her malpractice case?

I am all in favor of malpractice reform. I do not see any problem. I have even voted for a cap on tort cases in some instances. But I am not going to suggest that it is not a good thing for a trial lawyer to take a case like that, where somebody has been severely injured.

Another case, I will give one more, this was a Methodist minister. Greg Howard and Jane Howard were killed in an auto wreck with a truck, left behind an orphan five-year-old son. EDWARDS represented Golda Howard, who lost her son Gregory in a car wreck with a truck.

The truck driver was driving too fast and following the car in front of him too closely, and when the car in front of him braked, he swerved across the center line into Greg Howard's 1984 Honda civic head-on. Both Gregory Howard, a 31-year-old minister and Methodist camp director, and his wife were killed. They were survived by their 5-year-old son Joshua, who was not in the car. They are not supposed to be defended in this case?

Clearly there is no question that EDWARDS is someone who has cared about the little guy, and he saw being a trial lawyer as a way to give back and effectively represent people who had been seriously injured. These are not frivolous suits. That is not what we are talking about here.

I just want to give one more example, because I know the time has basically run out. I think it was my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina

(Mr. PRICE), or maybe it was the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), who mentioned EDWARDS' passion on the issue of Patients' Bill of Rights.

I remember, because you have been to some of our Health Care Task Force meetings that I chaired in the last few Congresses, and one day we invited Senator EDWARDS to come over to from the Senate and talk to our Health Care Task Force about the Patients' Bill of Rights, because it was something we were trying to get passed on the floor of this House.

He came over and was one of the best presenters and speakers that we ever had. I had never even met him before. This was a few years ago. I was so impressed about his passion and caring about patients and how they had to have their rights protected.

This is something that we still need. If a case arrives where an HMO says that a person is going to be denied care because they cannot have a particular procedure or cannot go to an particular emergency room because they need care, that is what this is all about in this House, representing the little guy, the person who is damaged, the person who needs healthcare.

He was a guy who came to our Health Care Task Force and talked with passion about how we had to get this bill passed. And we still need to get this bill passed.

It is somebody like him, as vice president, joining with JOHN KERRY as the president, that we can get something like that passed, because you know that President Bush and Vice President CHENEY have been very much against the Patients' Bill of Rights. They went to the Supreme Court and got the Supreme Court to basically void the Texas Patients' Bill of Rights.

So we need leadership. We need leadership in the White House. We need leadership at the vice presidential level as well, if we are going to see patients protected. That is what this is all about.

I am just so proud to be here tonight to say how proud I am that we have this great ticket that includes a North Carolinian.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend from New Jersey. Let me also thank the gentleman for being here and joining us this evening on this evening of special orders to talk about our ticket and for those of us from North Carolina to have a little swelled up pride about having a North Carolinian on the ticket for the first time in actually 140 years. We have to remember that really the person that was on there 140 years ago really was from Tennessee. He just was born in North Carolina.

So we have a great deal of pride in JOHN EDWARDS and the fact that our presidential nominee JOHN KERRY had, as I said earlier, the vision and the wisdom to reach out and touch him and bring him and Elizabeth along. I think they will add a great deal to the ticket, and I thank the gentleman for his comments and leadership.

As we said earlier, this thing of elections is really about the future. It is about our hopes, it is about our dreams. It is about responsibility on the part of individuals. But it is also about people who care. The gentleman's point was on target.

We are elected, all of us, here in this House and over in the Senate, to represent the people of this country. Every person that has a grievance, within reason, ought to be able to have us to deal with it in some way. If they do not get their shot and only those who have the money and the influence to have people to get things done, then the average person gets left out, and that questions a whole lot of things.

We talked earlier about our vice presidential nominee in JOHN EDWARDS. I like to think of the values that JOHN EDWARDS learned growing up in Moore County, in North Carolina, and they are the same values that I think I picked up growing up on a farm down in Johnston county.

When you grow up in a rural area, you learn you have to depend on your neighbors. I told a group the other day, I remember, today we would not think about going to our neighbor and saying I want to borrow a cup of sugar or a cup of flour or some coffee. But that is the way it was in rural North Carolina when JOHN EDWARDS was growing up. People would go over and do it, and then return it. Today we hop in the car and go to the store and get it, because you have a few more resources.

But I think among those shared values that he picked up and he learned were the value of hard work, love of family, faith in God and in our country, and a dedication to the larger community, where neighbors look out for one another, and everyone has a decent shot at the American dream.

JOHN certainly lives his faith every day. He is not the type of person that you see wearing it on his sleeve, where he talks about it. It is a part of him. I know actually even before he was in the Senate, our children, our two older children attend the same church he does in Raleigh, and he is faithfully there with his children every Sunday now that he is in the Senate, and he was before when he was in Raleigh.

He is really in touch with the American people, because he never lost touch with where he came from. Even though he grew up in Robbins and went to North Carolina State University and on to the University of North Carolina to get a law degree, he helped earn that money along the way to get his degree.

Yes, he has been successful, because he has worked hard. There is nothing wrong with a person working hard and being successful, as long as they are honest in what they do. That is what the American dream is all about. That is what public education is about, getting an opportunity to make it. And whether the issue is working to improve our schools, or bolster economic development to create good jobs, or making healthcare, as you have talked

about, a little more affordable for working families and available for those who have been injured, JOHN EDWARDS always had the family of small town America in mind, because that is where he comes from, where you grow up and the values you learn are the values you carry with you all your life.

Just like the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), when you grow up in a small town, you may move to the big city, but the old adage has been said, you can take the boy out of the country, but you cannot take the country out of him when you bring him to the city. JOHN EDWARDS is the same way. You have those things, those values you learned, that make all the difference in the world.

I once had the occasion to work in a cotton mill for about a year. We did not call them textile mills then, we called them cotton mills. There was a reason for that, because there was a lot of dust and lint in the air and they were hot, they were dusty and they dirty.

It was good work, and there were great people that worked there. They were great people. They were God fearing people that cared for their country and helped one another. But it is hard work, it is hot work and it is dirty work. His dad worked there for 36 years, and I can tell you it is hot in the summer because there is very little breeze.

I have heard some on the other side question why JOHN frequently mentions his father's work in the textile mill. I think it is an important point to make. I think he makes it because he wants people to understand not only does he care about his parents, but he cares what they taught him. Those are the values that he carries with him today.

JOHN KERRY recognized that when he said, "I want JOHN EDWARDS to join me," and he made that call last week. He understood it. He saw it in him.

I think JOHN EDWARDS is the embodiment of the notion that in America, the son or daughter of a mill worker has just as much right to run for higher office as the son or daughter of a President or a corporate tycoon.

I predict to you he has already shown himself to be capable and able, but I think the American people will see over the next several months and learn to love him; a young man who came from Robbins, North Carolina, married his college sweetheart, and has done quite well. He has the tools to be a great vice president.

I guess one of the other things I like about JOHN EDWARDS is he and I share probably only one other thing: He and I were both first in our family to go to college.

□ 2245

Madam Speaker, you have a heavy obligation when you do that, because you have an obligation to help others. He has a strong and abiding commitment to helping working families get

access to college, because he understands education is the one thing that levels the playing field. It does not make any difference what one's ethnicity or economic situation is, or who one's parents are or where you come from; if you get an educational opportunity, you have a chance to make it. He knows firsthand that a quality college education really is the key to the American dream.

I predict to my colleagues that as Vice President, he will fight to promote education, because he does know, as I have already said, it levels the playing field for everyone and gives them that chance for success. Those are the values that have made America great, and those are the values that he brings to this ticket. Those are the values that JOHN KERRY saw in JOHN EDWARDS when he made that decision. I predict to my colleagues that they will make a great team. They will make a difference in America; and that, as has been said by all of my other colleagues this evening in one way or another, they will give America hope again, because there are those who want to provide fear. They are about optimism and hope and dreams and possibilities and opportunities, so people can feel good not only about America, but our position with our allies and friends around the world, and that every person takes responsibility for themselves as we move forward into the 21st century.

Let me now close by thanking my colleagues for joining me this evening. And since I only have a couple of minutes, I want to close with a little poem. I think it says a lot about this ticket of JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. It is written by the person who writes more lines than anyone else. It is anonymous. It is entitled "The Builder." It goes like this.

"I watched them tear a building down, a gang of men in a busy town. With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell, they swung a beam and a side wall fell. I asked the foreman, 'Are these men skilled, the kind you would hire if you had to build?' He smiled and said, 'No, indeed. Common labor is all I need, for I can wreck in a day or 2 what men have taken years to do.' I thought to myself as I went my way, which of those roles have I tried to play. Am I being careful to measure the world by the rule and a square, or have I been content to roam the town, content to do nothing but tear things down?"

Madam Speaker, I predict to my colleagues that JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS will be builders. What this country needs is people with a good attitude, with a vision to build, bring people together, and let America be America again.

SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I have one issue that brings me to the floor tonight and that I hope to get to in a moment. As I listened, however, to my colleagues, it does come to mind that there would undoubtedly be a new vision for America if the ticket that they were extolling the virtues of actually becomes the leadership of the country as President and Vice President. It is true that there would be a difference in the way we look at life, the way we look at government in particular. It is certainly true that for those people who believe that the government is the primary focus of all of our activity and strength as a Nation, those people who believe that taxation can be euphemistically described as investment; those people who believe that the Constitution is really nothing more than a document that deserves to be interpreted, restructured, and changed by courts and judges; those people who believe that America's best days are behind us, those folks will indeed be happy if, in fact, the Kerry-Edwards ticket prevails.

Good men, I think, all good men are running for the office of President and Vice President of the United States. Certainly good things can be said about all. But it is undeniably true that we can also talk about the fact that incredible differences exist between the ways in which these people view their responsibilities as chief executive, as Commander in Chief; the way they look at the role of the United States in the world. One sees the United States as being subservient in many ways to international bodies, world courts, United Nations, other international organizations that I believe Senator KERRY and Senator EDWARDS think should have priority in terms of deciding how America actually goes about its business and determines its own policies.

Or President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, who recognize that although interaction with the world community is important, America must be strong enough and resilient enough to actually establish its own set of goals and purposes, and then act to achieve them, hopefully with the agreement of a large part of the world community; but even if that agreement were not to be reached, to understand that our goals may be unique to us, and that, therefore, we may have the responsibility of trying to achieve them, even by ourselves.

So there are certainly differences, undeniably true. That is the one thing with which I can totally agree with what our colleagues on the other side were talking about for the last hour, the differences that exist. But I believe that when the final tally is made, that most Americans will decide that the person who will decide who, for instance, is on the Supreme Court of the United States and will be making laws, interpreting laws for the next generation or two, because that is really how much of an effect it will eventually

have if two or three members of that Supreme Court have to be, or actually end up being, changed.

And when people think about the fact that we are in a war that does threaten our very existence, even if it is not described on the front pages every day as a war between armies and one moving and advancing, but one retreating, but nevertheless an understanding that we are in a clash of civilizations; when one thinks about these things, one will come to the conclusion that it is better to have people in charge who think about the Constitution as strict constructionists do, that it is a document to be adhered to because it was divinely inspired. They will think about the fact that those folks who they want making a decision about their national security are people who are desirous of having the support of the international community, but not willing to be subservient to it; and, I think, of course, they will come to the conclusion that they will keep the President, the present President and Vice President on for the next 4 years.

But that really was not the main purpose of my coming down to the floor tonight. When I came to this Congress in 1998, I determined that there were a number of issues that I wanted to focus on. One of them dealt with a situation that was developing in a land far, far away, a land that very few people really knew much about. I had become acquainted with it mostly through discussions at my church about the persecuted Christians throughout the world.

This land is known as Sudan. It is one of the largest countries in Africa. It is the poorest country in Africa. It has suffered through an enormous amount of pain. It has sustained itself after 27 years of internal strife. Two million, at least 2 million, are dead; four million, at least, displaced in this civil war that has been ongoing, as I say, for over 25 years. Little is known about it. Certainly, in 1998, very few people thought much about Sudan or, frankly, almost any other country on the African continent. But certainly, Sudan was not on the top of anyone's list as a nation that we should be concerned about, a nation that had any relevance for us in the United States or really anywhere else in the world. Yes, it was just another one of those countries that was involved with internal strife.

Many people died, but that is just the way it is over there, and that was the thought. That was, to the extent that anybody gave it any thought, to the extent that Sudan mattered to anyone, it was just another place on the African continent where people were dying and were dying because of the internal conflicts that we thought we had nothing to say about.

Well, in fact, several Members, including myself, Senator BROWNBACK, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) talked about this issue at great length every time we had the opportunity. Anyone who would listen, we

would talk about what was happening in Sudan. We would talk about this incredible tragedy that was evolving in front of our eyes. And we would ask people to be concerned, because it was a human tragedy of enormous proportion. And we found ourselves, frankly, in this strange sort of situation where the focus of the world was always taken away to a different place, to a different set of circumstances. Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia.

Mr. Milosevic, a name that most people in this body and certainly many Americans will recognize, Mr. Milosevic was the head of a country that was, as we determined, as this body determined, conducting genocide, that it was involved with ethnic cleansing, where thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of people were being killed. And we spent a great deal of time and we debated in this body at great length exactly what actions should be taken by the West, by the United States in particular, and by NATO, if the United Nations would not get involved. And the United Nations chose not to get involved, but the United States led the way with NATO to go in to Yugoslavia and to, in fact, change the situation there. And we did so at the cost of a significant amount of our treasure and, certainly, many lives were lost in the process.

But there was a general agreement that that was the right thing to do because something terrible was going on in the country at the time in Serbia. And so there was a debate on the floor and the permission was given and we went to war, essentially, with the United Nations and eventually overturned the regime, and the United Nations is now involved with trying to do some sort of rebuilding effort of the country.

□ 2300

By the way, it was not very successful. The economy is disastrous. There are now signs of ethnic controversy and conflict starting all over again. This time it is the Albanian Muslims against the Christian Serbians, but the United Nations seems helpless to try and do anything about it. And so we did that, and that was where all of our attention and resources were focused, at a time when, as I say, another part of the world was suffering far more, under any criteria you want to establish as to why anybody else should be concerned.

If you look at the Sudan, you will see a nation tormented, and you will see a level of human sacrifice, a level of human rights violations that is unprecedented since the Second World War. And yet no focus. Nobody cared.

And we talked and we talked about it, and finally I remember I got a call from Senator BROWNBACK's office, and I had only been in Congress for a couple of months. His staff person called our staff person and said, "I understand your boss is interested in Sudan. Well, so is mine, and we are going over there

in May, and does he want to come?" And I said, "Gee whiz, the Sudan? I have only been in Congress a couple of months, and I am really not sure. I always thought that our first trips were, like, Paris or Rome or someplace like that." That is what everybody always told me, that we were going to head out on these really exciting and cosmopolitan places, but in fact I said, okay, and I went with Senator BROWNBACK and with Congressman PAYNE to Sudan. And what I saw was, with my own eyes, the pictures of what many have seen of strife and horror and degradation of the human spirit, but I saw it with my own eyes, and it was a very moving experience, of course. It was one of those life-altering experiences.

I will never forget. There was a town called Yei, and it was a town that had been bombed often. And I remember there were a lot of chickens that the people would be watching, and people would talk about the fact that if the chickens started to run, because they could hear the engine of planes coming before the people, that the chickens ran, then the children ran, and then the adults ran, because they knew that was their early warning system, was the chickens who heard the actual planes coming.

And all these kids came around me and Senator BROWNBACK and others, and they gathered so close, you could hardly move. And they were shouting and they were looking up and they were pointing at the sky, and I asked the interpreter who was with us, I said, "What are they saying?" He said they are saying that they are going to stay as close to you as possible, because they do not think that they will be bombed. They do not think they will bomb an American Congressman. So they stand as close as they possibly can so they will not be hurt."

I said, "Well, you know, I hope they are right, but I don't think that anybody knows that I am here, but I hope they are right, of course." And I could see in their eyes the terror that they live through every single day. Most of them had lost parents, brothers and sisters. Many, many thousands and thousands were homeless, thousands were orphaned, and what they looked for was some degree of hope.

Now that was the situation in 1998, and we came back here and worked very hard, and we passed something. I introduced a bill, and it passed, and it is called the Sudan Peace Act. And it established certain criteria that had to be met by both the north and the south in terms of good-faith bargaining to come to some sort of peace agreement. And if they did not have that kind of good-faith bargaining, then there would be certain sanctions that we would apply.

Eventually, and just a few months ago, really, peace did come to that part of the Sudan that was afflicted by the civil war, and we are, of course, happy. A peace agreement was reached. The

details now have to be worked out, but the fighting between the north and the south stopped.

Now I have explained that part of this, well, that the world was told that the civil war in Sudan started because you have an Arabic Muslim north and a black Christian south, and really the cultures were in conflict. Certainly true. And that the north where the government exists in Khartoum was always oppressive, acted oppressively against the south, and that is certainly true. In fact, the north sponsored raids, actual slave raids.

Sudan is one of the countries left in this world that actually has institutionalized slavery, and slave raids were encouraged by the government of the north in Khartoum. The Arab Muslims would come down, raid villages, take people away, back into both sexual slavery and just slavery for the labor that could be obtained.

But this was the conflict, Arabic Muslim, black Christian. Well, because of the enormous amount of international pressure that eventually developed after years, literally years of pressing every government we could think of, including our own, to force some sort of peace in this war-torn area of the world, peace finally occurred of a sort. But then, almost I guess because it was too good to believe, there was too much hope that in fact some degree of tranquility could overtake this troubled land, another problem, another conflict began to develop, and this is in the Darfur region, western region of Sudan, mostly in the north, where again Arabs were confronting black Africans.

This time, however, there was no difference of religion. This is the very interesting aspect of this particular conflict, because it really does go to the heart of the entire conflict that has been there for 27 years, yet really is not Muslim against Christian. It is Arab against black. It is genocide. Yes, the word is genocide.

They have talked about this for a long time, the north, about how they wanted to essentially cleanse the south, but they certainly wanted to move everyone out of the north that was in fact black African. They have now embarked upon a genocidal war in this province of Darfur. So far, around 50,000 dead, 200,000 displaced, and the numbers are growing every single day.

The government of Sudan in Khartoum is aiding and abetting the Janjaweed. The Janjaweed, they are Arabs, traders, Arab militiamen, essentially, who raid, kill and rape, and they are given the arms and the go-ahead by the government of Khartoum to pursue this.

Of course, the Khartoum government tells us and the rest of the world they have nothing to do with it, they will try their best to stop this, but the only thing that they have stopped so far is the transportation of any resources, the transportation through Sudan into

this particular area of any of the food-stuffs that USAID or other NGOs, non-government organizations, are trying to deliver. They have done everything possible to halt any humanitarian effort to the region. They have done everything possible to aid the activities of the Janjaweed and to encourage them in this bloodbath.

Rape has become a tactic to advance the strategy of genocide. The women are told at the time of rape that they are impregnating them with lighter-skinned children and that they should leave once the child is born of that rape, that they could leave and leave the child, because the child would be of lighter skin.

The camps that have been established in and around the interior in Darfur, camps because, of course, people have been driven out of their villages and into these camps, the camps are surrounded by the Janjaweed. They patrol it, and they wait for people to walk outside. And the women come out in the morning, and they try to get out earlier and earlier to avoid attack, but the women are raped. The men are killed the minute they get outside of this camp. So there is no sustenance, there is no food, and now the rains are starting in Sudan in this part.

□ 2310

We have camps now with, as I say, a couple of hundred thousand people and more arriving every single day. There is no sanitation. There is very little food. All of them have been walking for some times hundreds of miles to get there. They are weak. They are starving. The rains are coming. Disease will spread and hundreds of thousands will die and it is planned. This is not just an accident. It is not just what is going to happen simply because of the forces of nature. It is going to happen because the government of Khartoum, the government of Sudan in Khartoum has designed this plan, to kill or move out the black people who inhabit this part of their country.

This is amazing. This is incredible that this could be happening in the world today, and again, relatively few people care.

Now, to the government's credit, Secretary Powell has gone to this area, just returned I think last week. He said that something like, well, I do not think we should argue about what it is called, whether it is genocide or something else. We have to do something. But the reality is we have to argue about what it is called because what it is called matters. If you say it is genocide, then there is a course of action that must be taken.

There is a 1948 agreement. It was signed by many nations of the world, including the United States. It is called The Genocide Treaty, and it sets up some criteria. And it says if this criteria are met, then in fact genocide is what is happening and you have to do certain things, including eventually maybe even military intervention. And

that is what scares everybody off, and it certainly scares us because, God knows, we are spread thin, it is true.

But I nonetheless believe that we must go to the United Nations, and we must ask them for a declaration of genocide, because everything that is happening in Darfur, in the Sudan meets those criteria. It is purposeful. It is designed to actually eliminate a certain specific group of people. They are black. That is their crime. They are Muslims. But they are being killed by Muslims who are Arabic. It is racism. It is the most virulent form of racism we can possibly imagine.

The world has to focus on this even though there are things that pull us away, I know.

It is interesting, there is an article in the Guardian Review, "Human Rights on Trial" by Nick Cohen, May 16, 2004. It says, we choose to ignore atrocities committed in the third world when it is politically expedient as in Sudan. It goes on to say that "there is a bell curve in the international appreciation of atrocity. Safe countries receive no coverage for the obvious reason that there is no atrocities to cover in, say, Denmark or Belgium. The curve begins to climb from these dull lowlands and hits its peak in countries which are dangerous but not too dangerous to make reporting to them impossible, today's Iraq and the former Yugoslavia in the age of Milosevic.

"From here the curve slithers down again until it reaches countries at the furthest extreme from civilized life which are either too dangerous or too tyrannical for free investigation to be an option for anyone but the recklessly brave, the Congo and North Korea today or Iraq before the war. The lesson for tyrants is they risk becoming the objects of global outrage when they are not tyrannical enough."

Is that not just great? Is that not an absolutely perfect description of what is happening in the world? There is this range or atrocity that we will cover because it is safe enough to do it, but then once it gets beyond that, no coverage, nobody pays attention to the worst of all.

"The rulers of Sudan know this well," Mr. Cohen goes on to say. "Foreign journalists are not murdered there but pretty much everyone else is. An extraordinary Islamists regime filled with apocalyptic fervor of the fundamentalist revival has enslaved Christians and animist tribes in the black African south, as it prosecuted a civil war which has claimed the lives of 2 million since the early 1980s. Two million is the provisional estimate of the number killed by the Khymer Rouge in Cambodia. But while every politically sentient person has heard of Pol Pot and the killing fields, I doubt if many know of President Omar al-Bashir of Sudan and Hassan al-Turabi, a cleric who provided the ideological justification for the terror until he fell out with his murderous patron.

"If the names ring a bell, my guess is that you are active in one of the Chris-

tian or human rights campaigns which has doggedly monitored the extermination campaigns. The killings have subsided," the peace act is in force, "and there is now a faint hope of peace agreement but this seemingly happy prospect has only made the randomness of global compassion more unhinged and unprincipled.

"This year is the tenth anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda. It has seen Kofi Annan apologize for ignoring warnings that a mass slaughter was about to begin. And every Western government except those that were guilty of sins of omission, except, inevitably, the French, whose despicable role in Rwanda came close to the sin of commission. As the air was filled with the drumming of chests being beaten and the cries of 'never again' being belted in languages except French, another African disaster was being ignored. Since the autumn of last year, Arab militias have driven 1 million people from their homes of the Darfur province of Sudan. Government forces have overseen and participated in massacres, the summary execution of civilians, and the burning of towns and villages. Those who escape now face the risk of famine."

Atrocities must be allowed to flourish so other atrocities can be prevented. That is one of the strange sorts of anomalies of foreign policy that we are dealing with. I think this article was fascinating for its insight into how we handle issues of this nature and how difficult it is to get the world to go act in situations like this.

Is it does seem odd, does it not, that we are willing to do so much more in other places of far less significance in terms of human rights tragedies? But we are all God's children. We are all made in his image and likeness, be we black, or brown or white or yellow. And for that reason we have to show compassion to those who are being persecuted. And we should act as vigorously in Sudan as we have in other parts of the world.

The Secretary of State should go to the United Nations tomorrow and demand a genocide statement be accepted and that the world, therefore, take action in Sudan. The government, every single time they have been pushed to the end, have retreated. They need to be pushed to the end again here. I hope and pray that we will do what is the right thing to do, what is expected of us as those occupying the moral high ground in the world, which we are. But in order to maintain that position, in order to keep the moral high ground, it is imperative that we pay attention to places like Sudan, even though I know our attention is being pulled in so many other places. And it is difficult because I do not know that there were any votes that anybody can count on if they champion this issue. I certainly cannot say that is true.

□ 2320

There are things that we should do here simply because they are the right

thing to do, not because there are any votes connected to it, not because there are any lobbying groups that are pressuring us, not because anybody's giving us money in order to champion a cause, but simply because it is the right thing to do. It is what we are asked to do as human beings of conscience, which is what I want to believe the United States still is, and I do believe it. It just needs to have its attention drawn to the areas of the world that command it.

So I do hope, Madam Speaker, that we will encourage our government to take every action possible, as I say, including any action that is designed to influence a decision by the United Nations that would lead to a declaration stating that genocide is actually what is happening.

Yes, the word matters. It is not the seeds of genocide. It is not a potential genocide. It is, in fact, genocide. Say it, let the chips fall where they may, and we can all rest easier because we have done what we can do, and that is all really God expects of any of us.

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 personal matters.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of airline delays.

Mr. GUTKNECHT (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and July 13 on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and until 2:00 p.m. July 13 on account of family medical reasons.

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 Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, July 19.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and July 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, July 15.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 13.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, July 14.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 218. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 103. An act for the relief of Lindita Idrizi Heath.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on July 8, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1731. To amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 13, 2004, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8986. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Aspergillus flavus* NRRL 21882; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2004-0164; FRL-7364-2] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8987. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C8, C10, and C12 Straight-Chain Fatty Acid Monoesters of Glycerol and Propylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2003-0379; FRL-7352-6] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8988. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lactic acid, n-propyl ester, (S); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2004-0040; FRL-7362-3] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8989. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfuric Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2004-0190; FRL-7364-4] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8990. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the grade indicated in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8991. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas C. Waskow, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8992. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Gordon S. Holder, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8993. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Donald A. Lamontagne, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8994. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: State of Alaska; Anchorage Carbon Monoxide Nonattainment Area; Designation of Areas for Air Quality [Docket #: AK-04-001; FRL-7777-1] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8995. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Emission Standards for Mobile Equipment Repair and Refinishing Operations in the Northern Virginia Volatile Organic Compound Emission Control Area [VA150-5079a; FRL-7777-7] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8996. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Definition of Volatile Organic Material or Volatile Organic Compound [IL218-2a; FRL-76618] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8997. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Portable Fuel Containers [MD135-3099a; FRL-7671-4] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8998. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Minor Corrections and Clarification to Drinking Water Regulations; National Primary Drinking Water Regulations for Lead and Copper [OW-2003-0066; FRL-7779-4] (RIN: 2040-AE58) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8999. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Preamble of the Final Rule to Implement the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard — Phase I; Correction [OAR 2003-0079, FRL-7779-2] (RIN: 2060-AJ99) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9000. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Equivalency by Permit Provisions; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Pulp Mills; State of Alabama [AL-112L-2004-1-FRL-7786-2] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9001. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Combustion Turbines [OAR-2003-0196; FRL-7783-7] (RIN: 2060-AK73) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9002. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Hawaii State Implementation Plan [HI 001-001a; FRL-7778-5] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9003. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Rule Corrections [OPPT-2003-0075; FRL-7332-3] (RIN: 2070-AC61) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9004. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 23(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the request for the Government of Egypt to cash flow finance a Letter of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) for the purchase of three fast missile craft, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9005. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 23(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the request for the Government of Egypt to cash flow finance a Letter of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) for the refurbishment of three CH-47C Chinook Helicopters to CH-47D configuration, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9006. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, trans-

mitting notification concerning the Department of Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 04-05), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9007. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles that are firearms controlled under category I of the United States Munitions List sold commercially under a contract with the Philippines (Transmittal No. DDTC 006-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9008. 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 Libya that was declared in Executive Order 12543 of January 7, 1986; to the Committee on International Relations.

9009. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of the imposition and expansion of the foreign-policy based export controls on certain energetic materials and other chemicals, taken in consultation with the Secretary of State and under the authority of Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended and extended by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, and the Notice of August 14, 2002; to the Committee on International Relations.

9010. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Solicitation for "Taiwan Environmental Study Tours" Project — received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9011. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9012. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9013. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9014. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9015. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9016. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9017. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and New Source Performance Standards for the Concentrated Aquatic Animal Production Point

Source Category [OW-2002-0026- FRL-7783-6] (RIN: 2040-AD55) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9018. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of additional prospectuses in support of the General Services Administration's Fiscal Year 2005 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9019. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Excise Tax Relating to Structured Settlement Factoring Transactions [TD 9134] (RIN: 1545-BB14) received July 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9020. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2004-51] received July 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9021. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determinations letters. (Rev. Proc. 2004-44) received July 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9022. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Rev. Proc. 2004-41) received July 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9023. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft bill "To amend titles 5, 22 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain travel expenses for Federal employees, Uniformed Service members and members of the Foreign Service involved in disasters or other catastrophic events, as well as the travel of their family representatives and agency representatives"; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform, Armed Services, and International Relations.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of July 9, 2004]

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3981. A bill to reclassify fees paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund as offsetting collections, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted on July 12, 2004]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3428. A bill to designate a portion of the United States courthouse located at 2100 Jamieson Avenue, in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Justin W. Williams United States Attorney's Building" (Rept. 108-595). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3734. A bill to designate the Federal building located at Fifth and Richardson Avenues in Roswell, New Mexico, as the "Joe Skeen

Federal Building" (Rept. 108-596). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4759. A bill to implement the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement (Rept. 108-597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEUTSCH:

H.R. 4812. A bill to require the National Institutes of Health to conduct and support research using human embryonic stem cells, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 4813. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 4814. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 4815. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4816. A bill to permit the Librarian of Congress to hire Library of Congress Police employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 4817. A bill to facilitate the resolution of a minor boundary encroachment on lands of the Union Pacific Railroad Company in Tipton, California, which were originally conveyed by the United States as part of the right-of-way granted for the construction of transcontinental railroads; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H. Con. Res. 471. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the life and legacy of Alexander Hamilton on the bicentennial of his death because of his standing as one of the most influential Founding Fathers of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

383. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial No. 2522 memorializing the United States Department of Defense to award the contract for the creation, development, and implementation of the Mobile User Objective System (MUOS), to the project team led by the Raytheon Corporation in partnership with Honeywell Space Systems; to the Committee on Armed Services.

384. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 memorializing the E.P.A. to reconsider granting an administrative waiver of the act's oxygenated gasoline requirement for California to the extent permitted by the federal Clean Air Act; memorializing the United States Congress, if an ad-

ministrative waiver is not granted, to enact legislation that would permit California to waive the oxygen content requirement for the reformulated gasoline; and memorializing the President of the United States to sign that legislation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 676: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 738: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 792: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 962: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HOFFFEL, and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 1212: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 1286: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1345: Mr. HONDA, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 1849: Mr. DAVIS of California and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1873: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1919: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 2034: Mr. CANTOR.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 2173: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 2509: Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 2624: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2929: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2954: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 3362: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H.R. 3424: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 3425: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 3463: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 3602: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3619: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 3716: Mr. VISLOSKY and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 3729: Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. JENKINS.
 H.R. 3779: Mr. BURNS.
 H.R. 3810: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 3845: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 4069: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HOFFFEL.
 H.R. 4110: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4306: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 4325: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 4354: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 4370: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 4376: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 4394: Mr. HOFFFEL.
 H.R. 4474: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4498: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 4578: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. FORD, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 4579: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4603: Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 4610: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 4633: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4634: Mr. PITTS and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 4641: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 4682: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr.

SANDERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BELL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. LEE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FORD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. Linda T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. FARR, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 4711: Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 4730: Mr. MURPHY.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 469: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 466: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. WATSON.

H. Res. 556: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. GIBBONS.

H. Res. 652: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 689: Mr. HOFFFEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 690: Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEINER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H. Res. 699: Mr. HOFFFEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 700: Mr. HOFFFEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 705: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. MCCREY.

H. Res. 709: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. TERRY

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE — ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salary of the Associate Director for Animal Health Policy and Operations at the Center for Veterinary Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration.

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Total appropriations made in this Act (other than appropriations required to be made by a provision of law) are hereby reduced by \$167,720,000.

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. BACA

AMENDMENT NO. 9: In title I, under the heading "COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$3,500,000)".

In title I, under the heading "OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$250,000)".

In title I, under the headings "COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE-RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES", insert after the first dollar amount, and after the dollar amount relating to Hispanic-serving Institutions, the following: "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

In title I, under the headings "COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE-EXTENSION ACTIVITIES", insert after the first dollar amount, and after the dollar amount relating to Indian reservation agents, the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

In title I, under the headings "COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE-OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS", insert after the dol-

lar amount the following: "(increased by \$750,000)".

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MS. KAPTUR

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide credits or credit guarantees for agricultural commodities provided for use in Iraq in violation of subsection (e) or (f) of section 202 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5622).

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MRS. MALONEY

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. 759. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to restrict to prescription use a contraceptive that is determined to be safe and effective for use without the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer prescription drugs under section 503(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. TIAHRT

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Add at the end (before the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 7 _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay for the

official travel of employees of the Department of Agriculture whose station of duty is at the Washington D.C. headquarters of the Department until the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to Congress that the Secretary has implemented a voluntary program under which beef slaughtering establishments may acquire and use rapid screen testing kits to test beef carcasses for the presence of bovine spongiform encephalopathy.

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 8, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,200,000) (increased by \$1,200,000)".

H.R. 4766

OFFERED BY: MR. WU

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS", and increasing the amount made available for "ANIMAL AND PLAN HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", by \$500,000.