urge all Members to support this concurrent resolution.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), the author of this resolution.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand before the House today to recognize our Nation's Native American veterans. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), who has worked very closely with me and my staff to recognize these brave warriors.

I have the privilege to represent eight tribes in Arizona, the largest of which is the Navajo Nation, home to the Navajo Code Talkers.

On my travels throughout Arizona district one, I have met many of these veterans and have heard their stories of sacrifice, valor, and patriotism and have seen firsthand their fighting warrior spirit that reinforces their commitment to serve our Nation in the Armed Forces.

Native American Indians and these veterans have served our Nation in battle long before they were ever considered citizens of the United States. From the Revolutionary War to the war in Iraq, a strong sense of patriotism and protecting the homeland has prompted Native Americans to answer our Nation's call. Many Native Americans come from rural areas where they learn to rely on the land and they learn to rely on each other for self-preservation and the family and the tribe and their national sovereign nation. These are inherent characteristics found in the best and brightest of our service personnel.

Five Congressional Medal of Honor recipients are Native Americans. Last year on Veteran's Day, I had the honor of presenting the Congressional Silver Medal in honor of nine Navajo Code Talkers on behalf of President Bush. This distinguished group of soldiers used their distinctive language to defeat the enemy in World War II. Today in the communities on the Navajo Nation, they are revered and are respected elders among the entire Navajo Nation because of their service to this country. It is an honor to recognize their service and to walk with them. And I rise today to give them our respect and the honor due from this Nation to those Native American veterans, whom we are so grateful and appreciative of their service.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for the representation and hard work that he has shown particularly on this issue.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Ms. BOSWELL).

(Ms. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy today to represent those in my district, an extension of the Sac and Fox Tribe, Meskwakis, great Americans, Native Americans, and a number of those that live in that settlement, as they refer to it there, in Tama County, Iowa, that I know that served as I did in Vietnam and other places. And I associate myself with the comments that have been made already by my colleagues. They have provided and will continue to provide a great service to our Nation. They always have. They are willing to step up and be counted and do their part and many times do more than their part. I found them to be very self-giving, to be sure; that the freedoms they enjoy at this time, regardless of the historical circumstances, they love our Nation, and they serve it with honor and distinction, and I am satisfied that they will continue to always do that.

So I appreciate the effort that has gone in to presenting this to us today, and I think that this is the right thing to do, and we probably ought to do this more often. So I am proud to share in these compliments to Native Americans. I urge adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 306, which honors the service of American Indian Veterans.

For more than 200 years, about 190,000 American Indians have served and defended this great country in military action. Their service is pronounced during our major wars. President Theodore Roosevelt and his Rough Riders recruited American Indian Scouts for the Spanish-American War. Choctaw Indians were used as Codetalkers in World War I. Comanche Codetalkers sent the first message on D-Day. When the United States has needed them in combat, American Indians volunteered to serve, regardless of whether they were federal citizens.

Today we are honoring American Indian veterans just like every year at hundreds of Pow Wows American Indians honor all American veterans. During these annual tribal celebrations, the "Prisoner of War/Missing in Action" flag is presented while the honor drum plays a "Veterans Song." Veterans take part in an honor dance, and are recognized for their heroism and service to our country.

I am proud to be part of this Congress that today recognizes the American Indians who have served our country. They have served bravely, and deserve our recognition. I thank Congressman RICK RENZI for introducing this worthy bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 306, as amended.

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

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution honoring the service of American Indians in the United States Armed Forces.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1800

UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE ACT OF 2003

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 163) to provide for the common defense by requiring that all young persons in the United States, including women, perform a period of military service or a period of civilian service in furtherance of the national defense and homeland security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 163

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Universal National Service Act of 2003".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. National service obligation.
Sec. 3. Two-year period of national service.
Sec. 4. Implementation by the President.
Sec. 5. Induction.
Sec. 6. Deferments and postponements.
Sec. 7. Induction exemptions.
Sec. 8. Conscientious objection.
Sec. 9. Discharge following national service.
Sec. 10. Registration of females under the Military Selective Service Act.
Sec. 11. Relation of Act to registration and induction authority of Military Selective Service Act.
Sec. 12. Definitions.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL SERVICE OBLIGATION.

(a) OBLIGATION FOR YOUNG PERSONS.—It is the obligation of every citizen of the United States, and every other person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 18 and 26 to perform a period of national service as prescribed in this Act unless exempted under the provisions of this Act.

(b) FORM OF NATIONAL SERVICE.—National service under this Act shall be performed either—

(1) as a member of an active or reverse component of the uniformed services; or

(2) in a civilian capacity that, as determined by the President, promotes the national defense, including national or community service and homeland security.

(c) INDUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—The President shall provide for the induction of persons covered by subsection (a) to perform national service under this Act.

(d) SELECTION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.—Based upon the needs of the uniformed services, the President shall—

(1) determine the number of persons covered by subsection (a) whose service is to be performed as a member of an active or reverse component of the uniformed services; and

(2) select the individuals among those persons who are to be inducted for military service under this Act.

(e) CIVILIAN SERVICE.—Persons covered by subsection (a) who are not selected for military service under subsection (d) shall perform their national service obligation under this Act in a civilian capacity pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 3. TWO-YEAR PERIOD OF NATIONAL SERVICE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the period of national service performed by a person under this Act shall be two years.

(b) GROUNDS FOR EXTENSION.—At the discretion of the President, the period of military service for a member of the uniformed services under this Act may be extended—

(1) with the consent of the member, for the purpose of furnishing hospitalization, medical, or surgical care for injury or illness incurred in line of duty; or

(2) for the purpose of requiring the member to compensate for any time lost to training for any cause.

(c) EARLY TERMINATION.—The period of national service for a person under this Act shall be terminated before the end of such period under the following circumstances:

(1) The voluntary enlistment and active service of the person in an active or reverse component of the uniformed services for a period of at least two years, in which case the period of basic military training and education actually served by the person shall be counted toward the term of enlistment.

(2) The admission and service of the person as a cadet or midshipman at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, or the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(3) The enrollment and service of the person in an officer candidate program, if the person has signed an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service with an obligation to serve on active duty if such a commission is offered upon completion of the program.

(4) Such other grounds as the President may establish.

SEC. 4. IMPLEMENTATION BY THE PRESIDENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) MATTER TO BE COVERED BY REGULATIONS.—Such regulations shall include specification of the following:

(1) The types of civilian service that may be performed for a person's national service obligation under this Act.

(2) Standards for satisfactory performance of civilian service and of penalties for failure to perform civilian service satisfactorily.

(3) The manner in which persons shall be selected for induction under this Act, including the manner in which those selected will be notified of such selection.

(4) All other administrative matters in connection with the induction of persons under this Act and the registration, examination, and classification of such persons.

(5) A means to determine questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from induction under this Act, including questions of conscientious objection.

(6) Standards for compensation and benefits for persons performing their national service obligation under this Act through civilian service.

(7) Such other matters as the President determines necessary to carry out this Act.

(c) USE OF PRIOR ACT.—To the extent determined appropriate by the President, the President may use for purposes of this Act the procedures provided in the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.), including procedures for registration, selection, and induction.

SEC. 5. INDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Every person subject to induction for national service under this Act, except those whose training is deferred or postponed in accordance with this Act, shall be called and inducted by the President for such service at the time and place specified by the President.

(b) AGE LIMITS.—A person may be inducted under this Act only if the person has attained the age of 18 and has not attained the age of 26.

(c) VOLUNTARY INDUCTION.—A person subject to induction under this Act may volunteer for induction at a time other than the time at which the person is otherwise called for induction.

(d) EXAMINATION; CLASSIFICATION.—Every person subject to induction under this Act shall, before induction, be physically and mentally examined and shall be classified as to fitness to perform national service. The President may apply different classification standards for fitness for military service and fitness for civilian service.

SEC. 6. DEFERMENTS AND POSTPONEMENTS.

(a) HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.—A person who is pursuing a standard course of study, on a full-time basis, in a secondary school or similar institution of learning shall be entitled to have induction under this Act postponed until the person—

(1) obtains a high school diploma;

(2) ceases to pursue satisfactorily such course of study; or

(3) attains the age of 20.

(b) HARDSHIP AND DISABILITY.—Deferments from national service under this Act may be made for—

(1) extreme hardship; or

(2) physical or mental disability.

(c) TRAINING CAPACITY.—The President may postpone or suspend the induction of persons for military service under this Act as necessary to limit the number of persons receiving basic military training and education to the maximum number that can be adequately trained.

(d) TERMINATION.—No deferment or postponement of induction under this Act shall continue after the cause of such deferment or postponement ceases.

SEC. 7. INDUCTION EXEMPTIONS.

(a) QUALIFICATIONS.— No person may be inducted for military service under this Act unless the person is acceptable to the Secretary concerned for training and meets the same health and physical qualifications applicable under section 505 of title 10, United States Code, to persons seeking original enlistment in a regular component of the Armed Forces.

(b) OTHER MILITARY SERVICE.—No person shall be liable for induction under this Act who—

(1) is serving, or has served honorably for at least six months, in any component of the uniformed services on active duty; or

(2) is or becomes a cadet or midshipman at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, the United States Merchant Marine Academy, a midshipman of a Navy accredited State maritime academy, a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval aviation college program, so long as that person satisfactorily continues in and completes two years training therein.

SEC. 8. CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION.

(a) CLAIMS AS CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR.—Any person selected under this Act for induction into the uniformed services who claims, because of religious training and belief (as defined in section 6(j) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. 456(j))), exemption from combatant training included as part of that military service and whose claim is sustained under such procedures as the President may prescribe, shall, when inducted, participate in military service that does not include any combatant training component.

(b) TRANSFER TO CIVILIAN SERVICE.—Any such person whose claim is sustained may, at the discretion of the President, be transferred to a national service program for performance of such person's national service obligation under this Act.

SEC. 9. DISCHARGE FOLLOWING NATIONAL SERVICE.

(a) DISCHARGE.—Upon completion or termination of the obligation to perform national service under this Act, a person shall be discharged from the uniformed services or from civilian service, as the case may be, and shall not be subject to any further service under this Act.

(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section shall limit or prohibit the call to active service in the uniformed services of any person who is a member of a regular or reserve component of the uniformed services.

SEC. 10. REGISTRATION OF FEMALES UNDER THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT.

(a) REGISTRATION REQUIRED.—Section 3(a) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. 453(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''male'' both places it appears;

(2) by inserting ''or herself'' after ''himself''; and

(3) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the person''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 16(a) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 466(a)) is amended by striking ''men'' and inserting ''persons''.

SEC. 11. RELATION OF ACT TO REGISTRATION AND INDUCTION AUTHORITY OF MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT.

(a) REGISTRATION.—Section 4 of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 454) is amended by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) This section does not apply with respect to the induction of persons into the Armed Forces pursuant to the Universal National Service Act of 2003.''.

(b) INDUCTION.—Section 17(c) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 467(c)) is amended by striking ''now or hereafter'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''inducted pursuant to the Universal National Service Act of 2003.''.

SEC. 12. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''military service'' means service performed as a member of an active or reverse component of the uniformed services.

(2) The term ''Secretary concerned'' means the Secretary of Defense with respect to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard, the Secretary of Commerce, with respect to matters concerning the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with respect to matters concerning the Public Health Service.

(3) The term ''United States'', when used in a geographical sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(4) The term ''uniformed services'' means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, commissioned corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and commissioned corps of the Public Health Service.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Does the gentleman propose a parliamentary inquiry?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the proponent of this motion to suspend supports the bill, and, if he does not, whether or not his motion is in order.

Mr. MCHUGH. Is that a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, it is.

Mr. MCHUGH. I know the gentleman thinks it is. I am waiting for direction from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the question of who controls time in favor of the motion is relevant.

Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) favor the resolution?

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would say I support the consideration of the this bill at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman repeat his comment?

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the consideration of this bill at this time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the question that I raised before I raised the point of order is not whether he supports consideration of the bill but whether he supports the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XV, if the proponent of the resolution does not favor the resolution, then another Member may claim the 20 minutes in support of the motion.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, based on that, I raise a point of order, and I would like to claim the time in support of the resolution.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would say, if I may, in response to the gentleman's claim, that I am disappointed he has less faith in his power of persuasion than I do, because I came here prepared to be persuaded. But if I must decide now, I would vote no, so I do not claim to be a proponent of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) may control 20 minutes in support of the bill.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, that leaves me where? I would claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair affirms that 20 minutes is reserved for a Member in opposition. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) may claim that time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Under the rules of the House, I would claim that time in opposition.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to this bill.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has already been claimed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As a matter of recognition, the Chair would award the 20 minutes in opposition to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of comity, I would be happy to split the time in opposition with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, so I understand, am I entitled to the time in opposition? I am the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) will control 10 minutes, half of the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am claiming the entire time in opposition, as the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has awarded the 20 minutes in opposition to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), who, by unanimous consent, has agreed to split the time with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Just to summarize, the Chair would advise that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) will control 20 minutes, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) will control 10 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because it gives this great august body an opportunity for the first time to discuss whether or not the administration or the party in the majority intends to have a draft.

I suspect that one of the reasons that this has to be cleared up before the election, the evidence clearly indicates that everyone in the Pentagon, the Defense Department, has indicated that we need a robust military force in Iraq. All of the evidence indicates that we have exhausted our active troops; we are exhausting the Reserves; we are exhausting the National Guard.

We have a back-door draft, where we do not let people who enlisted and have finished their term get out. In addition to that, the Army is over there in combat. Where the normal term is 1 year, the Pentagon has indicated they are going to reduce it to 6 months, to go along with what the Marines do, because of fatigue.

It just seems to me as many times as the administration says that they are against a draft, all we hear on the Internet and around the country is that, after the election, they are going to have the draft.

If they are going to have the draft, I support this legislation, even though, quite frankly, I would have preferred that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, because I think it is important enough to have hearings on this matter and for the administration to really show why they really do not need to get people through an involuntary conscription.

But since they knew I had this bill and since they knew it was election time, I rise in support of the bill, even though I would gladly yield to the committees of jurisdiction, because it just seems to me that, if we abuse the system by continually taking legislation for the purpose of embarrassment and not in order to say that it is so noncontroversial that we should put it on the suspension calendar, then, no matter who is in the majority, we are violating every principle of the House, and that is the reason why the Parliamentarian and the Speaker have decided that I am in control of the time.

This system should be used only when there is no controversy. But I am not a Member of the House that runs away from controversy. Those who run away from it are those people who have the responsibility to discuss bills in the committee with hearings and bring the legislation so the American public can see what you do believe before an election.

But now you cannot even decide who is for the bill, who is for consideration, ''I want it up; I want it down.'' It is a political thing that you are using that determines the lives of people as to who fights in wars and who is exempt from wars and who should do national service.

It is a disgrace, what is going on here today, and you cannot find anyone to put the blame on. You are against your own bill. It came out of your Committee on Rules. You have the majority. But yet you need some way, some vehicle.

And just because justice does not cave in to people who are hypocritical in nature, we got the time to tell you why we support the bill and why we oppose the bill. But, unfortunately, we are doing this on the suspension calendar. The majority, I guess, will say that this is a noncontroversial issue, because if you do not admit that it is controversial, then you are saying that it should not have been on this calendar in the first place.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is much controversy here. Nobody is going to vote for this bill. If it were controversial, I think we would have a very close vote here. I doubt we will. In fact, I was not going to raise a point of order. I will not. I would ask the Chair rhetorical without expectation of a response, what happens when the sponsor claiming the time in support of the bill actually will vote against it? It will be interesting to see how the final tally is actually taken.

I am fascinated. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York, my fellow New Yorker, but I find it a bit amusing at best to hear him claim that the reason that this is a controversial issue is we read about it on the Internet. The only thing we read about on the Internet is what some of his colleagues are planting with respect to that.

The basis for our being here today is simply to answer the concerns of the

American people that have been created by political forces who are trying to create controversy where none should exist. The administration clearly, the Department of Defense clearly, and I suspect that at the end of this vote it will be shown the House of Representatives clearly rejects the fact, either before an election, at election or after election, that there is a need, there is a rationale, for returning to mandatory conscription by the United States military.

I would say to the gentleman from New York that he is the only sponsor of a bill in my 12 years in the House that is complaining that his bill has been brought to the floor. We have a great deal of respect for the gentleman. I suspect and I strongly believe he put together his bill with a great deal of conviction and belief, and we felt it time, given the Internet discussion and all the other absolutely baseless charges that were floating about, that this issue be put to rest, not for the issue and not for the concern of politics, but for the comfort of the American people who have been whipped into a frenzy unnecessarily about this issue.

Now some may say today that this legislation is really about the need to establish a system of national service—an attempt to instill in our youth a sense of responsibility and a clearer understanding of the sacrifices made over many years to win our freedoms—and what it takes to better secure our future. And I would say—that is a legitimate topic of discussion—an area that perhaps merits exploration.

But the clear objective of this bill—and the undeniable intent of recent claims of secret plans and post election plots is focused on a return of the draft—forced military conscription.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have seen something that I have never seen in 28 years in the House of Representatives, never; someone whom I respect and consider a good friend, someone bringing a bill to the House floor that they do not support. That is news. That is the first time ever and probably in the history of the United States House of Representatives.

So I am in strong opposition to this bill. I am surprised that the Republican leadership would bring the bill to the floor. And why? Not to reinstate the draft.

The fact that the Republican leadership would bring this bill to the floor suggests to me, as an observer, several reasons: The war in Iraq is not going well. The President's plan to handle this situation with a minimum number of troops is not working, and we need more in-strength, as Paul Bremer just told us. And this tacit allegation that the administration wants to reinstate the draft right after the election. One of those three.

Americans should take notice of the fact that the House leadership thinks we need to resume the draft by bringing it up.

I have said before on occasion what Mark Twain once said, ''The more you explain it to me, the more I don't understand it.'' Why are we wasting our time, precious time, we ought to be talking about health care, be talking about the deficit, be talking about taking care of the troops. And, my goodness, I am so proud of them, and the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and I have worked so hard to try to take care of those troops with body armor, to try to take care of them with pay raises, and I know he is disappointed as well in bringing this bill up.

□ 1815

And at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, to bring this bill to the floor is nothing more than a cynical election year political ploy. If you want to play politics, go rent yourself a truck bed and get yourself a microphone and get a crowd and talk there, but this is not an electionary place. This is where we make the laws of the United States of America. And for someone to bring this bill to the floor that does not support it, does not want it, and wants to make a political point, well, I need not finish that sentence.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, bringing up a bill today, nearly 2 days since it was introduced without a hearing, to anybody in any committee, nothing, to just bring it up today, 3 days before the end of the session, makes it very clear what is on the minds of the leadership in this House. This is a smoke screen to divert the focus from the real facts about the war in Iraq.

The authors of this bill want a hearing. Why do you not want a hearing? Why do you want to bring it up out of nowhere? This was not even scheduled. Yesterday, this was not scheduled or noted for scheduling.

But they do not want a hearing because they do not want the public thinking about the fact that, as of today, we have spent nearly $200 billion on this war, the United States has lost over 1,000 lives, these figures represent 90 percent of the costs of the war, and more than 90 percent of the casualties in what the President continues to paint as a global problem led by a willing coalition, when no coalition exists.

Worse, the President sends our troops into Iraq without body armor, without sufficient troop strength, and without any discernible exit strategy, and guess what? We are running out of troops. It is not a secret, I say to my colleagues. We are continuing to keep National Guardsmen in the service beyond their career. We are taking Reservists and we are running out of volunteers. So let us not be astounded that what follows that is a draft. The only problem is that we cannot announce it until after the election.

Bringing this bill up today—nearly two years since the day we introduced it—is nothing but a Republican attempt at a smokescreen to divert the focus from the real facts about the war in Iraq.

The Republicans don't want the public thinking about the fact that as of today, we've spent nearly $200 billion on this war, and the United States has lost over 1000 lives. These figures represent ninety percent of the cost of this war and more than ninety percent of the casualties—in what the President continues to paint as a global problem led by a willing coalition. No such coalition exists. Worse, President Bush sends our troops into Iraq without sufficient troop strength, and without any discernable exit strategy or plan to win the peace. The Administration doesn't want the public to know that, when it comes to Iraq, this President has failed the American people.

Even Paul Bremmer, the U.S. official who governed Iraq after the invasion, has admitted that the United States made a mistake in not deploying enough troops in Iraq, and then made a mistake in not containing the violence and looting after the ouster of Saddam Hussein.

The Administration doesn't want to call attention to the fact that the Pentagon has had to resort to the use of a ''stop loss'' policy to mask the fact that we do not have enough troops in Iraq. This policy is in a sense a military draft because it is used to keep tens of thousands of soldiers bound for Iraq and Afghanistan in their service beyond their originally scheduled discharge dates. Under this policy, the Army alone has blocked the retirements and departures of more than 40,000 soldiers, about 16,000 of them National Guard and reservists who were eligible to leave the service this year. This just shows that politics has taken priority over readiness. The administration uses these policies to meet the needs in Iraq because they are expedient and convenient, but all it amounts to is playing politics with the lives of the men and women overseas, and with their families back home.

And while the Administration likes to talk about what a good job it's doing in Iraq, it consistently fails to mention the other impending crises we will eventually have to deal with. Iraq does not scratch the surface when you consider the situation we're in with North Korea and Iran.

No, rather than have the American people focusing on these facts and statistics, the Republican members of Congress want to use this bill as a political maneuver to kill rumors that the President plans to reinstate the draft after the election. The Republicans want to use this bill—a bill that strives to bring equality to our military—to shift the focus from their extreme and devastating shortcomings.

What our bill does is address the growing disparity in socio-economic background between those who go to fight our nation's conflicts and those who send them. The statistics show that minorities and the working class segments of society constitute a disproportionate percentage of the military. African Americans represent 21 percent of the military as opposed to 13 percent of the civilian age population. Only 24 percent of the persons in

the military have parents in white collar management jobs, while that is true for 34 percent of the general military population. It is plain fact that the military does not come from the higher socio-economic status of society.

This bill deserves better than placement on the suspension calendar. It deserves serious consideration. As my colleague Mr. RANGEL has stated, we should be hearing testimony and gaining an understanding of our needs in Iraq. But as it stands, the Republicans only care about his bill to divert attention from the true fact—that the President has made a colossal error in judgment that is costing American lives every single day.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan feels it is inevitable, he has a chance to vote for the resumption of the draft, if that is what he wants. By the way, he said the bill was introduced 2 days ago. I suspect he misspoke. It was introduced in January of 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked, why is this bill calling for a draft being offered on the floor when it is apparent that nobody on the Republican side wants it and the reason we are doing this is to expose the biggest hoax in show business. The hoax has been carried out through the Internet where millions of young people are being scared by some anonymous tipster who is claiming that somehow, there is a secret plan to reinstate the draft.

So what are we going to do? We look over at the bill and the only bill that has been offered to reinstate the draft is offered by Democrats. It is offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), it is offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), it is offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), it is offered by Democrats and not a single Republican has cosponsored it.

The President of the United States says in this message from the White House, he will veto this Democrat bill to reinstitute the draft. Mr. Rumsfeld says he will oppose this bill. He says, we are meeting our recruitment goals with both the Army and the Marine Corps, we do not need a draft, and he will oppose it; every Republican will vote against it.

The reason we are doing this is to expose this hoax of the year, which has been needlessly scaring millions of young people, driven by a bill that not a single Republican has signed onto. And let me tell my colleagues, not a single Republican in my estimation will sign onto it and the bill will not pass; and I invite the Democrats sponsoring this bill to carry out their position and vote for it tonight if they want to.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill to reinstate the draft, but I really want to thank the Republican leadership for bringing the bill to the floor, even though they oppose it, to highlight this administration's complete mismanagement of the war in Iraq.

Imposing a draft is not the right solution, but it is time we recognized a real problem. Our military is overstretched, overcommitted, and close to the breaking point. Last week, Paul Bremer, the former Iraqi administrator, acknowledged that we should have had more troops in Iraq to deal with the counterinsurgency which has resulted in over 1,000 Americans dead. He is only the latest to call for an increase in the size of our military.

From former Army Chief of Staff General Shinseki, whose appeal for more troops in Iraq fell on deaf ears, to General John Riggs, the head of the Army's transportation efforts, who called for an increase in end-strength beyond 10,000 troops, to the Pentagon's own Defense Science Board, which warned last week that inadequate troop size means that the United States cannot sustain current and projected global stabilization commitments, the strain on our military is increasingly obvious.

Guards and Reservists make up 40 percent of our mission in Iraq, and those who have served and survived are not able to come home because there is nobody to replace them. The Army Guard will fall short of its recruitment goal by 5,000 personnel for the first time since 1994.

I have a bill to increase the end-strength of the military, which is a responsible way to reduce the stress on the force. But instead of scheduling my bill, the leadership has scheduled a vote on the draft that they do not even support.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and join me in calling on the Pentagon to substantially increase the size of our voluntary military.

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

I want to applaud the candidness and the honesty of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to admit that they are using the Rules of the House of Representatives to rebut the rumors on the Internet that President Bush wants to enact a draft. I thought we did this through the Republican National Committee. This is a political thing.

It may be vicious to believe that people do not trust the President when he says no, and they do not trust Rumsfeld, and they do not trust Republicans; that is a terrible political problem, but do not use my House of Representatives to correct it. Do not use the rules of this House to correct it. This place is a place for legislation and not to play political games.

If you do not have the trust of the American people when you say there is not going to be a draft, then you had better use the Republican National Campaign Committee to rebut it. But each time you think you have to run an election on the Rules of this House, after all of us are gone, we have an obligation to those who succeed us to abide by the Rules of the House that were left to us for one purpose: not to win elections, but to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and I put this bill in in January of 2003 because we knew that not every American was at equal risk, that the wealthy would not go, and the war would be like all the others. But no one wanted to talk about it then. They buried it over in the Defense Department. We have not heard about it until this very day, on the day the Vice President is going to get up and debate tonight. We will see.

Now, why are we here today? We are here because you are afraid. You are afraid that the young people of this country are watching television. You are afraid that they do not believe the President, they do not believe Mr. Rumsfeld, they do not believe Condoleezza Rice, they do not believe anybody who tells them there is not going to be a draft, because they see what you are doing to the Guard and what you are doing to the Reserves and what you are doing to the individual Ready Reserves that you are pulling back in. They know you are not telling the truth.

Now, these kids may have funny hair and they may look odd and have rings in their nose and whatever, but they know the truth, and they are on the Internet blogs and the telephone. Every time the President denies it, the phone calls pour into our offices: When is it going to happen?

Now, we know that if Mr. Bush gets reelected and he comes up here and asks you for a draft, we have got to have more troops and we are going to do it this way or that way, you will roll over for him like butter in the hot sun. There will not be anything left of you but a puddle of butter, because you know that you will not be able to stand up to him. And the fact is that the kids have got it right, and now their parents are listening and are saying, Oh, my God, there might actually be a draft.

It would not be hard to do. Let me tell my colleagues how it works. Just announce that there are not going to be any loans for college. You can get $80,000 if you enlist, but if you are not going to enlist, you are not going to get to go to college on government money. Rich mommies and daddies will take care of their boys, but poor ones will have to go to the military.

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

I am stunned by the fact that my friend from New York stands up in his beginning comments and sites the reason we have to deal with this is because the Internet is saying so, and then criticizes people that it is an Internet rumor. He seems to be very comfortable with his Presidential candidate's position of being everywhere at every time.

Also, I would just say to the gentlewoman from California, who complained about her bill and increasing end-strength, the House Committee on Armed Services which, as we will remember, has already passed a bill into the House and we are in conference with the Senate, would increase end-strength by almost 40,000 troops. So we have responded to that this year and have for the past 2 years as well. Frankly, we did not need her bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a distinguished member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for bringing this to the floor. This is, I say in all disappointment, an incredible insult to the men and women who wear the uniform. Why is it an insult? Because our men and women are the best, brightest, best trained, best equipped, most effective that the world has ever known. They are a tribute to the education process in this country and the ability of young people to stand up and serve their country.

My dear friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), whom I admire and trust and respect, raised the point, and I think it needs to be expanded a bit.

People have gone all over this country in the beds of pickup trucks anywhere someone would stick a microphone in their face, and the minority political operatives have used it as an opportunity not just to scare youngsters, but to scare moms and dads and grandparents about something that does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. Support the bipartisan effort to increase our ROTC on college and high school campuses. Let us honor the young men and women who are fighting for us today with a degree of skill, accuracy, and commitment that we have never seen.

Mr. Speaker, today we bring to the floor a matter of great importance to our troops, and an issue about which there has been much misinformation. The legislation before us, H.R. 163, would essentially reinstate the draft, requiring all young persons, including women, to perform a period of military service.

Those who are in favor of this legislation declare the draft is necessary for two reasons. They argue that recruiting and retention of our armed forces are falling at alarming rates and they asset that the military is disproportionately comprised of poorly-educated individuals.

This is one of the greatest insults to our military I have ever heard. Today our armed forces are the most professional, best educated, most integrated and best trained in the world. All one needs to do is spend a few moments with our troops. Yesterday I was at Ft. Bragg in my district in NC. Talking with service members, is one of the most motivational things I ever experienced. These soldiers, often youngsters, are skilled, well-trained, articulate, intelligent, dedicated to their country, and model citizens. They endure hardships and sacrifice because they want to serve. Let me repeat: they want to serve. They are patriots who want to contribute to their country and serve their nation. They are proud of their service and we as a grateful nation should express nothing other than gratitude and praise for what they do. Our military today is not a repository for poor kids with little education and few opportunities in life. The U.S. military didn't get to be the most technically advanced fighting force in the world by relying on a collection of high school dropouts and underachievers.

Simply stated, we have the finest and most professional military in the world. To suggest otherwise and argue that we need a draft to bring educated, skilled people into the military, is one of the most degrading insults to our troops that I have ever heard and furthermore is true not true.

Secondly, I would like to point out that even though tours have been long, many sacrifices have been made and our troops have been called on for extraordinary missions, recruiting and retention is going well for all 5 services. Retention for the active component is over 100 percent and reserve retention rates are at 99 percent.

The recent call for additional combat capability in Iraq and Afghanistan to conduct the global war on terror has fueled misconceptions that the United States will need to reinstate the draft to perform its military missions. There is only one reason that would justify conscription: if the military were unable to recruit enough volunteers to meet its personnel needs. This is not the case. Needed military personnel strength increases can be achieved through the existing recruitment and retention system. We should increase ROTC on high school and college campuses to highlight the high tech careers available through our military and further enhance our already successful recruitment efforts. No one in the Administration, at the Department of Defense, or at the Selective Service System has advocated for the reinstatement of the draft in any form.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is poor public policy, and pure politics and a disgrace to our troops. The all-volunteer force established the best and most professional military in the world. Our troops are disciplined, resilient and experienced, prosecuting the Global War on Terrorism and numerous other missions since 1973 with valor, bravery and honor. Continuing to uphold the high standards our military personnel embody everyday is only achieved through a voluntary force. I urge my colleagues to honor those who have individually decided to serve their country and vote against this election year legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it is insulting and disgusting for the Republican Majority to make a joke of serious war and peace policy by bringing draft legislation to the floor as a frivolous matter, as a joke.

Every member of the House who is against the draft should join me as a co-sponsor of H.R. 4746, the Selective Service Registration Termination Act. The attached "Dear Colleague" letter of June 25, 2004 provides a fuller explanation of H.R. 4746

This bill proposes the termination of the selective service registration system which requires that all eighteen-year-old males register. This lost component of the system maintains a large manpower pool readily available for the quick implementation of a draft. This bill takes away the draft option and guarantees that future policy makers must confine their adventures to actions which can be launched and maintained with only a volunteer military force.

H.R. 4746 clearly indicates that in the case of a full declaration of war by the Congress of the United States the Selective Service System may be reinstituted. Only as a last resort should a war be declared and mandatory proscription be authorized.

In the case of a draft there must be no exemptions for the rich and the powerful. If a draft is implemented the rich and powerful should go first. Attached is a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD submitted on July 16, 2003 which expresses the conviction which must guide any future draft: Let the rich go first.

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Jun. 25, 2004.

WORKING FAMILIES NEED JOBS, NOT GUNS AND UNIFORMS—WE MUST TERMINATE SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRATION

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have introduced the "Selective Service Registration Termination Act" (H.R. 4746) in order to dismantle the machinery of a draft which would suck American youth deeper into the quagmire of the Iraq War and also provide manpower for new preemptive wars. Our nation is at a pivotal point with respect to the use of military force to protect our vital interests around the world. The worship of the false god of war would be lessened if we take clear and careful steps to reduce the pool of potential combat troops. Continuing a volunteer army policy will provide a strong restraint and check on new violent adventures.

Every presidential candidate must be made to pledge that there will be no implementation of a draft after the election. Working families need jobs, not guns and uniforms. Preparations for a draft are presently an underground, covert, ghost operation as we move toward election day; however, there are distinct actions which point the way to a future sudden "common sense" announcement that the machinery of the draft must be reactivated. Please note that the Senate recently authorized a twenty thousand soldier increase for the Department of Defense. All experts have agreed that unless circumstances change the size of the occupying army in Iraq must be greatly increased. Instead of the creation of a vast new pool of cannon fodder, we must insist that "the circumstances must be changed."

"Shock and Awe" invasions must not continue to be an alternative for the unilateral

confrontation of enemies in the war against terrorists. The machinery of diplomacy; a world wide network of coordinated intelligence; and the maintenance of the capacity to execute swift, targeted actions must replace the obsolete and costly total war strategy. Ending the draft system is the most practical step available to use to force the end of reckless war as an alternative.

Working families need jobs, not guns and uniforms. Support a giant step toward lasting peace. Please join me by cosponsoring H.R. 4746 by contacting Larry J. Walker at 225–6231.

Sincerely,

MAJOR R. OWENS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the July 10th vote to allow the expenditure of funds to implement radical changes in the overtime provisions of the Wage and Hour Act was an outrageous and devastating attack on working families. Compounding the horror of this action is the recent announcement that our present compliment of soldiers in Iraq, ninety percent of whom come from working families, will be forced into combat overtime for the indefinite future. Not even the one year rotation rule of Viet Nam will be applied to relieve their long ordeal under extreme heat and guerilla warfare duress.

Overtime in the dangerous defense of the nation is being mandated without controls while at the same time overtime wages to feed working families is being subjected to new schemes which reduce take-home pay. This is an unacceptable continuation of the gross exploitation and oppression of working families by the Republican Scrooges who presently dominate the Congress and the White House. This nation faces a tragic predicament: An elite group of juvenile old men have plunged us into a war where great suffering and pain is being inflicted on working families who bear the brunt of the casualties on the front lines as well as the fallout from economic dislocations and recession here at home.

It appears that the Republican well-to-do decision makers have great contempt for those who do the dangerous and dirty work for our nation. All Americans must remember the debt we owe to those who risk their last full measure of devotion. Or perhaps the powerful and the rich should go to the front lines first. The RAP poem below is a summary of my indignation on this critical action:

LET THE RICH GO FIRST

Working Families
Keep your soldiers at home,
For overtime in Iraq
No cash
No comp time
Not even gratitude,
Republicans intrude
To exempt all heroes,
No combat rotation
Life on indefinite probation
Scrooges running the nation.
To the front lines
Let the rich go first—
For blood they got a thirst,
Let the superstars drink it
In the glorious trenches;
Leave the disadvantaged on the benches.
Working Families
Let the rich go first:
The battlegrounds they always choose
Their estates have the most to lose;
Send highest IQs to
Take positions at the front,
Let them perform their best
High tech warfare stunt;
Working Families
Keep your malnourished sons home—
Harvard Yale kids should roam
The world with guns and tanks,
Reserve gold medals
For the loyal Ivy League ranks.
O say can you see
Millionaire graduates
Dying for you and me?
Welfare Moms
Have a message for the masters:
Tell Uncle Sam
His TANF pennies he can keep
For food stamps we refuse to leap
Through your hoops like beasts;
Promise to leave our soldier alone
And we'll find our own feasts.
To Uncle Sam we offer a bargain—
Don's throw us dirty crumbs
Don't treat us like bums
And then demand
The full measure of devotion;
Our minds are now in motion
Class warfare
Is not such a bad notion;
Your swindle will not last
Recruiters we won't let pass,
Finally, we opened our eyes—
Each family is a private enterprise.
Each child a precious prize;
We got American property rights,
Before our children die in war
This time we'll choose the fights.
Let the rich go first:
They worry about
The overtime we abuse;
The battlefields they always choose
Their estates have the most to lose.
Let the rich go first!

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I think this debate is pointing out something very important: This is a rich man's war and it is a poor man's fight. We have some of the finest young people in the world over there in the Mideast that are dying, better than 1,000 of them, and better than 8,000 have been wounded; but about 20,000 have had to be MedEvac'd out of there because of injuries and things of that kind.

□ 1830

We do not have enough troops in the field to prevail. We had enough to win a war, but we do not have enough to win the peace, and we do not have enough people to police and to control a situation which is getting worse and worse and worse.

The question is, if you are not going to have a draft, and I am not going to sport legislation, but how do you propose over here to get our people the troops that they need, to get the levels of force that they need to win? It is easy to stand around here and talk about, oh, how we must support our troops, it sounds very patriotic. But let us get some people over there. Let us get the necessary levels of force. Let us get the equipment that we need over there for our people.

I would note, there is not enough equipment like body armor. There is not enough armor for the Humvees. Our people are dying in good part because of this, and they are dying in good part because there are not enough of them to properly address the problem of a clever and well-managed insurgency which is killing thousands of young Americans.

I say that we are going to have to have a national debate on this. I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for having forced this issue to the House floor. I say, rather than making political points on this, my Republican colleagues should start to address something more important: Address how you are going to win; address how you are going to get the number of troops; address how you are going to produce the levels of force that are going to enable us to win, to get our people home safely and to carry out our real duty to the American people.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, well, I just want to echo the dean, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his courage.

Frankly, let me say to my colleagues on the floor of the House, there is a secret plan for the draft. And there is nothing, there is nothing that this debate will do to dispense with that rule more and that secret plan. Let me tell you why. Because you have got 1,000-plus dying. You have 7,000-plus that are already wounded. You have the highest number of AWOL persons who are not returning. You have soldiers doing 24-hour duty. And I realize that, when you are in combat, you are at the subject of your commanders, but you are doing a 24-hour duty, and people are frustrated and tired and overwhelmed. You have people who cannot get medicine. And you have individuals who are National Guard and who are Reservists who are away from their families and are being told, just 2 more months, just 6 more months.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is imperative to those who are listening. To the young people, I am voting no. But this was a protest to say to the President and the administration in January of 2003 when this war was raging, what is your exit strategy? What is your strategy to win the peace?

We have none.

Secretary Rumsfeld can make a joke and talk about surprise all he wants. That is not befitting of a Secretary of Defense. The military brass have indicated they need more soldiers, and it is true they come from the inner cities and rural communities. My voice may be a little raspy, but these children went into this war because they wanted an education. That is what Jessica Lynch wanted. That is what so many wanted. That does not undermine their patriotism or their heroism or our honor to them or the ones that died; they died in vain. But this is a debate

to pull the covers from those who want to hide from the fact that they need a draft.

What you need to do is not send our troops into misdirected and ill-directed wars. Then we will not have to have this debate. I will vote a resounding ''no,'' but there is a secret plan for a draft.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, and it proves perfectly why we are here tonight because that is what the message is the American people are listening to, what the gentlewoman just said. And there is one way to dispel this, and that is to defeat this. No President can impose a draft without the consent and the approval of the United States House of Representatives. It will not come tonight or at any other time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, sometimes, not always, but sometimes a bill comes to the floor of this House after a long deliberative examination of the facts surrounding a difficult issue with compelling arguments on both sides, and we can all come together and find common ground. Sometimes a bill is the result of hard-nosed political wrangling, and a party-line vote pushes a controversial measure over the finish line.

And sometimes, Mr. Speaker, on rare occasions like today, a bill is considered on the floor of the House as a practical exercise, to expose a fraud. For months now, the American people have been subjected to and had their intelligence insulted by a manipulative, dishonest and willful campaign of misinformation. This campaign, which started as a whisper and now is being supported on the floor of the House, but it has since been given voice by the leading Democrats in the country today, asserts without any evidence whatsoever that there is a secret Republican plan to reinstitute the military draft.

This campaign is a baseless and malevolent concoction of the Democratic Party, and everyone in this chamber knows it. It has one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to spread fear, to spread fear among an unsuspecting public, to undermine the war on terror, to undermine our troops, to undermine our cause and, most of all, to undermine our commander-in-chief in an election year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a lie. And to prove it, all we had to do was to look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And lo and behold there it was, a plan. Not secret, but public. Not hidden by Republicans but openly touted by Democrats, H.R. 163, before us today. H.R. 163 is not the product of a Pentagon cabal, but it is sponsored by six of the most liberal and vociferous critics of the war on terror.

The vote on this bill will not be close, and it will not be a party line. Instead, it will be an opportunity for Americans to see who takes the national security of the United States seriously, who respects our armed forces, who wants to win the war on terror, and who just wants to win the next election.

This bill is a fraud, and so is the pernicious campaign of deception that has brought it to the floor today. I urge all my colleagues to vote no and expose to the light of truth the craven partisan whisper campaign now poisoning the national debate.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I rise in opposition of this bill, but I would like to clarify something. We are not trying to scare kids. This President's foreign policy is what is scaring the kids of this country. And people have said today, why are people believing this? Why are people believing this big Internet hoax?

It is the same people who told us that Saddam Hussein had something to do with 9/11; the same people who told us Saddam Hussein had something to do with weapons of mass destruction; the same people who told us we would be able to use the oil for reconstruction money; the same people who told us we would be greeted as liberators, not occupiers; the same people, the same President who told us the Taliban is gone; the same President who told us that Poland is our ally 2 days before they pull out; the same President who tells us Iraq is going just great; the same President who tells us the economy is going just great; the same people who told us the tax cuts were going to create millions of jobs; the same people who told us that the Medicare program only cost $400 billion when it really cost $540 billion.

So please forgive us for believing what you are saying. Please forgive the students of this country for not believing what you are saying. Not one thing, not one thing about this war that has been told to the American people or that has been told to these college students has been true. Not one thing. Bremer says we need more troops. The Pentagon says we need more troops, and this President cannot get them from the international community. There is only one option left. Let us be honest with the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) who is an outstanding member of this House of Representatives, and he is in support of this bill.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I hate to rise in opposition to both leaderships on both sides of the aisle. I am probably the only one that is going to vote for a draft. I believe we have to start looking at this right now. And I will tell you why it is a serious problem. We have 135,000 troops in Iraq right now. We are going to have to have 135,000 there for at least 2 years. We are training people, the Iraqis about 4,000 a month, and a lot of them are deserting. So there is no way that we have had cooperation with the international community. There is no way we are going to be able to do the fourth round of replacement without some kind of a draft.

Now, I remember the President of the United States asking to extend the National Guard in 1941, just a few months before the attack on Pearl Harbor. He extended it by one vote, and this is serious business here. We can get up and talk politics, we can get up and blame each other for what we are involved in here, but we have to have the personnel to do this job.

I go out to the hospitals every week, and I see these young people who are in their second and third tours in Iraq. I see them without legs and without arms, and I know how hard this is.

Now, let me tell you, on the street that I lived on when I was a kid, four people in my family, my father and three of his brothers, were involved in World War II. Some of them were drafted, and some of them were volunteers. And in the next house, there were seven from the same family. In the next house from that, there were six from the same family that went into World War II. Now, they went; some drafted, and some not drafted. We had 15 million people. We are in a war. And not only a small segment of the population should fight in that war.

I voted against the volunteer army in the first place because I said that I did not believe that, if we got into a crucial situation, we would be able to sustain our national security. This is a national security problem. This is something we have to face now.

I remember standing right over here when Jack Kemp was a Member, and he did not want to vote to extend registration because he believed it was not necessary. I said, Jack, we have to be prepared here. We have to be prepared in case something happens.

They have advertisements for the volunteer army, and they say, we want you to come in. We want you to get an education. We want you to better yourselves. We want you to come in, and you will have a steady job, and an

awful lot of people joined the military with that in mind.

I was talking to a father the other day. He said his father was in World War II. His uncle was in the Battle of the Bulge, and another uncle served in the Pacific. And he was in the Reserves, and his boy was just killed in Iraq. And he was so worried because they were sending people back for the second and third time.

I mean, we have got people in the National Guard who they have stopped letting out. His son was supposed to come home in August, and he was killed.

Now, that is the kind of thing we are facing. This should not only be borne by people who are volunteering because they could not find a job. This is something that every one of us across the board, rich and poor, everyone should be willing to serve in the armed services of the United States.

□ 1845

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

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and support his position.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would take this seriously. I would hope that we would not get into a political debate about whether this is politics or not. I would hope we would look ahead.

What I said before, my colleagues have got to remember we have got 135,000 troops on the ground. We have sent some of these people back a couple of times. The Army is looking at the possibility of having a 6-month tour, and that will not help the situation because they are going to have to send them back sooner. Some of the people who are supposed to be home for a year are unable to stay home for a year.

I remember being in Europe talking to General Jones, and they extended the 1st Infantry Division. He was worried that the families, because they extended them, how many people would be killed and what a pressure that would put on the families. All of us worry about that. All of us have to worry about that. That is our job, and we have to look ahead.

We cannot just look ahead to the election. We have got to look ahead after the election at what it is going to mean to our troops.

I think that we make a mistake when we get up here and accuse each other when we are in a war. When we were in a war in World War II, we were attacked here, and everybody ought to be willing to serve. I mean, a draft is a fair way to cut, no deferments for anybody. We pick it by lottery; we take the number of people we need and send it down to the Armed Forces.

Let me tell my colleagues something. They are already taking category fours, and I think that is good for the country. I think it is good because the best training people will get in the world today is the military training. They will take category fours, and they will make those people into good citizens. They will work them, and the Army does not like it. The military does not like category fours because it is too much time to train those people.

Let me tell my colleagues something. All of us need everybody to go into the Armed Forces. From every level, from the rich and the poor, from the middle class, everybody needs to go, and we have to, and there is no question about it. If we are going to be there, if what the leaders on both sides are saying, both candidates are saying, we are going to be there. We are not going to leave there until the Iraqis can take over. They cannot take over overnight. It is going to take time to train those people; and if we are going to train those people, we have got to have somebody in the United States who can replace them.

It takes us a year to train. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman, and I put in the money for the extra 30,000 people because we knew they needed 30,000 people this year. I asked the personnel guy, are you going to ask for this in the budget this year? He said, no, sir, we are going to expect a supplemental to take care of it.

The point is, we needed an extra 30,000 people. We have got to face that we are in a war, and we have got to face that everybody should be bearing the burden of this war, not just the few volunteers that are time after time sacrificing and the young people are being so mangled by this war. Their spirit aside, they are doing a marvelous job and are so proud.

When I go out to the hospital every week, Bethesda one week and Walter Reed the next week, and I see these young people, and even then the fighting is so intense that they are saying to me, this is a tough war, Congressman, and we need help, we need support; and we are giving them support. In this Congress, we are giving them everything they need except we are not looking ahead to the very thing that we are going to need down the road and that is additional troops, and we are not meeting the requirement of the National Guard, and that is the first step.

So I would ask Members to reconsider this, and I would hope that a number of us would vote for a draft as a serious business rather than talking of politics and the whole thing.

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

There are few people I have more respect for than the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He made a very eloquent argument, very correctly, for an increase in end strength, not to a return of the draft and for the problems that that would create.

We have an end strength increase of 40,000 in our bill in the House that has passed, and there is a conference with the Senate. Those are the people we need, and we should move on that and not a draft.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are voting on today has been used by Democrats to scare young voters and their parents with the lie of an impending draft.

As a retired veteran of 31 years' service in the Army National Guard, with three sons serving today in the military, including one serving in Iraq, I agree with the Newsweek magazine expose of October 12 which discredits the rumor has having no basis in fact. Crying wolf about the need for a draft causes doubt about the ability of our Armed Forces and hurts our morale and recruitment.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against H.R. 163 and end this false rumor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are voting on today has been used by Democrats to scare young voters and their parents with the lie of an impending draft.

In South Carolina, the Democratic Party sent out a despicable campaign letter, disguised as a draft notice. The Democratic Presidential Candidate John Kerry speaks disingenuously about a ''back door draft.'' He has said to elect him President because he ''will give us a foreign policy that absolutely makes it unnecessary to have a draft.'' Democrats' false rhetoric has helped fuel a nationwide scare campaign.

As a retired veteran of 31 years service in the Army National Guard, and with three sons today in the military, one of whom is serving in Iraq, I agree with the Newsweek magazine's exposé (Oct. 12th) which discredited the rumors as having no basis in fact. Crying wolf about the need for a draft causes doubt about the ability of our Armed Forces, and hurts our morale and recruitment.

Let's be clear. The all-volunteer American military is succeeding in the War on Terror, and retention remains high. We have the best-trained, best-equipped, most competent military in history. We have a new greatest generation that I have visited three times in Iraq who are dedicated patriots protecting American families by taking the war to the terrorists. There is absolutely no need for a draft. Not one person in the executive branch supports or has talked about reinstating the draft.

Clearly, by resorting to the politics of fear, KERRY and the Democrats have no positive agenda for America. Americans deserve more. President Bush and Republicans have a proud record of achievement in the last 4 years: of tax relief, better education for our children, improved health care through prescription drug coverage, and a strong national defense against terrorism.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against H.R. 163, and end this false rumor.

[From Newsweek, Oct. 11, 2004]

THE DRAFT: RUMORS, AND THAT'S ALL THEY ARE

For months, Democratic operatives have muttered that news about a revived military

draft could become the silver bullet that stops President George W. Bush's re-election campaign. But the White House and Pentagon emphatically deny any intention to reinstitute conscription: in the first presidential debate last week, Bush made sure to include a reference in his closing remarks to the ''all-volunteer Army.''

Democratic presidential contender John Kerry carefully limited his debate remarks to a factually supportable charge that current Bush policies may constitute a ''backdoor draft'' because some soldiers' tours of duty are being involuntarily extended. But some Kerry supporters—and prominent Kerry surrogates—are spreading more alarming rumors about a reinstated draft. ''You do not have the draft hanging over your heads—not yet. But pay attention, boys and girls, to what you've got going on in Iraq,'' disabled Vietnam vet and former U.S. Senator Max Cleland, an important Kerry backer, recently told a student audience. At the University of Colorado-Boulder last week, cafeteria tables were littered with cards signed by self-described Students for Kerry, warning YOU'RE GONNA GET DRAFTED. (In an ''open letter'' to America's students, independent candidate Ralph Nader recently claimed the ''machinery for drafting a new genration of young Americans is being quietly put into place.'') The most explicit claims about a Bush plan to revive conscription have come from onetime Kerry rival Howard Dean, who charged in a recent newspaper column that draft boards ''have already been notified that 20-year-olds and medical personnel will be called up first.'' Laura Gross, Dean's spokeswoman, says Dean spoke with two draft-board officials in different parts of the country who told him they had been ''put on notice there is going to be a draft . . . Bush has not denied that there's going to be a draft.''

Rumors about a new draft were sparked when a Pentagon Web site earlier this year posted a solicitation for volunteers to man local draft boards. But officials say the ad has appeared every year since 2001, and didn't signal a plan to reactivate the draft. Two bills in Congress propose reviving conscription, but both were introduced by anti-Iraq-war Democrats to highlight the fact that the burden of military service falls disproportionally on poor people. The bills have no chance of approval. Selective Service spokesman Dan Amon says he has fielded ''hundreds'' of calls about the possibility of a renewed draft, which he calls an ''urban legend . . . If the White House is planning a draft, you'd think they might have told us about it.'' The uniformed military are among the last people who want to see the draft revived. While U.S. forces are stretched by current commitments—including Iraq—Army leaders don't want a draft, don't think they need one and recognize that, politically, it would be virtually impossible. Two-year waves of unwilling, unskilled soldiers would contribute little except, the brass fear, the same discipline problems the Army spent years purging after Vietnam. Army lobby spokesman John Grady says: ''Nobody wants to go there again.''

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents to know that Congress is not going to legislate a draft today, but I also want to ask my constituents and all Americans to read between the lines.

What is going on here today? What they are seeing is an admission of this administration's failure to adequately plan for our troops in Iraq. What they are seeing is a bait and switch.

On the one hand, Americans are being told today that they do not need to worry about a draft, and believe me, this was an issue that if my colleagues would have left it alone, it would have died on the Internet. But on the other hand, I am afraid that Americans will think that they are being told there is nothing to worry about in Iraq.

What we are seeing is a very controversial matter being brought up before Congress by using a procedure that is meant for noncontroversial items.

I want to acknowledge how much military servicemembers' contributions have meant to Americans through their voluntary and selfless service. And how do we honor them? Well, we honor the profound and valiant successes by keeping our forces strong.

The solution to our overburdened military lies in expanding the all-volunteer force; and this solution, as it has been stated, has been voted on and passed by both Chambers of the Congress. It provides a much-needed increase in military end strength, and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have worked hard to provide the solution.

I feel strongly, and I know that most of the people here do, that everyone benefits from keeping an all-volunteer force. So I urge my colleagues to stand firm with this conviction, but I also say let us have a serious discussion. Let us not make this political.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask what time is allotted for each Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 30 seconds remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the draft, and I understand the reason why we are having this debate.

What I do not understand is when are we going to have the debate about the flawed intelligence that led up to the war. When are we going to have the debate about the disregard of the recommendation of General Shinseki and now Ambassador Bremer? When are we going to have a debate about a failure of international negotiations to bring more coalition partners in?

This is a worthy debate, but it is not worthy of the sacrifice that these men and women are making around the world. Let us have a real debate about the real issues that confront us in Iraq.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the gentleman's heard of the 9/11 Commission.

I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Military Time, 72 percent of the military, active, Guard, Reserves, are going to vote for President George W. Bush, not JOHN KERRY.

Why we are here today is there has been a ruse before the American public. Some people thought they would scare people into thinking the President was going to reinstitute the draft. You have been caught in your own trap. That is the reason we are here today is to show the American people that it is a spoof.

When you talk about politics, you are the ones that put forth politics, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), you how I love you, and when you talk about politics on this floor, you need to take a look within your own party.

It was your leadership that voted against the money to give our troops the support that they need. It was JOHN KERRY that voted against the money to support our troops. You know that, and you are caught here today trying to spoof the American people; and shame on you, shame on you and shame on you.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, are we allowed to use the floor of the House to campaign and specifically name the Presidential candidate that we are supporting?

Did I frame my question correctly?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may refer to Senators who are nominated candidates for the office of President. But the gentleman from California is admonished to direct his remarks to the Chair.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I mentioned earlier that this is a moment in history when someone brings a bill to the floor that does not support the bill. In my years here in the House of Representatives, I have never seen that.

I think it is also historic for another reason, that this piece of legislation was brought to the floor to quell a rumor. That, I am sure the history books will never reflect, never reflect the fact that legislation was brought to the floor to quell a rumor.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close, and so if I only have 1 minute remaining, I reserve it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here is to make clear to the world that we are not going to have military conscription right now for active military duty.

I introduced a bill last year, H.R. 3598, because I think we need to seriously discuss the understanding of the military of a greater number of our population. I think we need to look at volunteerism in this country; and with terrorism threatening us for the immediate future, there is a need for that education, that training, maybe even basic military training, but not combat service.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

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

We are here for three reasons. Number one, because the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has proposed reinstating the draft. It is a legitimate piece of legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has given an articulate reason that we should consider it, and it is legitimate to consider it.

But the other reason why we are pulling it out at this time is because of pieces like this that were sent out by the South Carolina Democratic Party, as well as a number of things that went out on the Internet, saying to college kids like my 19-year-old son John and my 21-year-old daughter Betsy that there is going to be a draft and there is a secret plan.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has already stated there is a secret plan. We are voting ''no'' to show there is no secret plan and also ask our colleagues on the floor to talk to their Democrat friends and tell them not to send out propaganda pieces like this, because it is just a lie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who yields time? The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has the right to close.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

□ 1900

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the legislation, and I read the words of a young Arizonan now at war from the pages of the Arizona Republic, a letter. He writes, ''As I sit on this plane taking us to war, I can't help but think about who is with me. Americans from all walks of life are going to war together on this plane. Americans going to war on this plane are ages 18 to 59. Americans going to war on this plane are rich and poor, Americans on this plane joined for different reasons. All are volunteers.''

It is a strength to have a volunteer fighting force. We rise remembering the words of Captain Moore, ''We have a great volunteer force.''

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a veteran of the first Gulf War.

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bill. I also join the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and regret that the heat of national elections has caused us to debate something that is not going to happen.

We are here because it was JOHN KERRY who implied that President Bush would reinstate the draft, and it was CBS News and its anchor, Dan Rather, who have chosen to keep telling the ''big lie,'' as noted in the editorial of Investors Business Daily.

Fortunately, I believe Americans will know better. President Bush has not said he will reinstate the draft. There is good reason Americans are tuning out CBS News and will tune out this bill. Vote ''no'' on the draft.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the short time I have to close our side of the debate by pointing out some facts.

It has been contended by the other side that we are having trouble attracting and retaining people in the armed services. The facts do not bear that out. In fact, they point just the other way.

Last year, for example, the Army attracted 74,000 new soldiers. That was 100 percent of the goal set. Furthermore, the Army and Army Reserve retention goal for fiscal year 2004 is 28,201. As of June of 2004, with 3 months left in the fiscal year, the active Army had achieved 98 percent of its year-to-date retention goal, the Army Reserve had achieved 96 percent of its goal, and the National Guard had exceeded its goal by 30 percent.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, new weapons systems that we have today require manpower but they also require brain power. It takes time to cultivate competent soldiers and Marines, and by drafting our soldiers we slide down the scale of our professional Army towards a more amateur and, I contend, less effective military.

Let us all vote to oppose the draft today.

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

Mr. Speaker, very simply, this is a bill that is necessary to be dealt with in what I agree is perhaps an unconventional way, but nevertheless has caused great anxiety, great fear and concern amongst mothers, fathers, and children. This is a way to put the fear aside. That should be a primary duty of the House of Representatives. And, as I suspect even the proponents will, a ''no'' vote is the right vote.

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

My Republican colleagues have convinced me they will not vote for a draft before this election, and I appreciate their sincerity in stating that. But I support my bill for the very reasons that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has done so.

If the issue is the protection of our country against an enemy, then all Americans should have the opportunity to fight and defend for all our freedom so that we can sit here. And there should be a plea for the rich and the poor, which is so eloquently stated but not followed, to be volunteering and joining and having the honor to say they defended our country at a time of war.

Mr. Speaker, that is not going to happen before the election, and because of my 34 years in the House and my respect for the rules, as much as I appreciate the fact that the leadership has brought my bill up, even though they did not support it, they have brought my bill up because they have a problem with the President's integrity on this issue.

So as much as I appreciate that, what I appreciate more are the standing committees that we have in this House, and so I would hope that my bill will be referred to the committee process for hearings so that the entire House of Representatives would understand the necessity for this legislation.

But on this I will vote ''no''.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of the Universal Service Act and rise in support of this bill.

That being said, this vote today is a cynical political ploy. The Republican Leadership did not bring this vitally important issue forward to have a meaningful debate. They did it to buy themselves political cover from accusations that President Bush's failed policy in Iraq will necessitate a new military draft.

I object to this cynical misappropriation of our democratic responsibilities by the Republicans. We are here to do the people's business, not dispose of it thoughtlessly for mere political gain.

I am a cosponsor of the Universal Service Act. I support reinstating the draft, not because it is popular, but because I believe it is right.

Many of us remember World War II. That was a war fought by Americans of every stripe and every background. It didn't matter if you were rich or poor or the color of your skin. All Americans sacrificed and shared the responsibility for winning that war. It was everyone's patriotic duty and our country was better for it.

Today armed forces ought to strive to meet that example. Reinstating a draft with no deferments and no exceptions is both fair and democratic. It will mean that Americans of every background will serve our country, not just the poor and disadvantaged as it is today. It will mean that our troops, reservists and members of the Guard won't be forced into extended deployments well after their tours are up.

Ultimately, I would hope that a draft will deter future wars of convenience like that in Iraq. I'm sure many parents—and Members of

Congress—will think twice about supporting a war if they know their children may be called to fight.

This, of course, is not being genuinely debated here today. Instead this is a political charade that demeans the importance of this issue.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 163, the ''Universal National Service Act of 2003.'' This legislation is being brought to the Floor by the Majority without holding any hearings which would provide for the necessary debate an issue this magnitude requires.

There is no doubt that the military is currently overextended worldwide. National Guard members and Reservists have been sent overseas for extended missions, leaving their families behind. While we are eternally grateful to them and all the members of the U.S. military for their bravery, I am sad to say that when they return home, they will discover that this Administration has cut many critical veterans' benefits. The Department of Veterans Affairs and the health care system it oversees are not prepared for the numbers of new veterans who will need long-term care for their injuries. This Nation's veterans deserve nothing less than the benefits to which they are entitled.

I think we can all agree that a strong military is critical to our Nation's defense. However, I think that we can accomplish this goal by ensuring that those who are currently serving have the necessary equipment and resources to complete their missions and the benefits that they and their families deserve. If we need to increase the size of the military, there are ways to do it other than through a draft.

I hope that when we consider these issues in the future, the Majority will be more respectful of our service men and women.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 163. I do not believe that a reinstatement of the draft is necessary or desirable; nor do I believe that there is any support for a draft among my constituents or in the country as a whole.

This Nation has had an all-volunteer military for more than 30 years and the quality of America's service men and women, their dedication, professionalism and commitment has never been greater. Public support for our men and women in uniform is also much higher than it was in the later years of the draft.

Today's soldiers typically stay in the military 2 years longer than their predecessors did in the early 1970s. This reduced turnover has resulted in a more professional force that is able to take full advantage of the high-tech weaponry that is a key component of our military. The volunteer military's lower turnover rate has also led to a reduction in training costs. In 1988, a General Accounting Office study found that the all-volunteer force was cheaper than a conscript force by $2.5 billion per year—more than $4 billion in today's dollars.

Volunteers are more likely to seek promotion, and are likely to be more professionally motivated than draftees. In fact, current retention rates among deployed troops are higher than for forces based in the United States. Because volunteers are paid more and it is costly to train new soldiers, there is a greater incentive to use our troops wisely.

The military has also been successful in its efforts to increase the aptitude of recruits. Today's military is better educated than the general population. While more than 90 percent of military recruits have a high school diploma, only 75 percent of the general population does. Military recruits are also more likely to score high on aptitude tests than their civilian counterparts.

I was, frankly, surprised to see this bill on the suspension calendar for today. Typically, bills are brought up under suspension when they are non-controversial as a two-thirds vote of the House is required for passage. This bill, which enjoys virtually no support in the House, will be resoundingly defeated and I can only surmise that the Majority has only called up this bill in order to vote it down, and in so doing divert attention from the mistakes made by the Administration in overextending our forces.

We do have a military manpower shortage now, but the draft is not the answer. Over the objections of the Administration, the House has authorized the Army and Marine Corps to increase their active-duty end strength by 20,000 and 10,000, respectively. This will help to alleviate some of the strain on both the active and reserve components.

I hope that the Congress will focus attention next year on military manpower issues. We need to reconfigure our military and address the need for personnel who specialize in stability and post-conflict operations. Currently, most of the personnel who are expert in this area are in the Guard and Reserves and there are reports that re-enlistment rates in some units are down as a result of multiple extended deployments overseas.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have visited our troops on the front lines as often as possible. I am awed by their courage, their patriotism and their competence. We need to do more to support them and to ensure that they are not overextended, but reinstating the draft is not the answer. Better treatment of those who wear the uniform, and those who once served, is the more constructive solution.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. With the modern technology found in most weapons today, the U.S. military needs a more highly educated force than it needed years ago. Also, the United States does not need the large numbers of soldiers our armed forces required in previous large wars. Our all-volunteer military is working well, and we have raised pay and benefits up to higher levels than most would be making in the private sector.

Secretary Rumsfeld agrees. In recent testimony before the Armed Services Committee in the other body, he noted:

''We've got 295 million people in the United States of America. We need 1.4 million to serve in the active force. We have no trouble attracting and retaining the people we need.''

''We are not having trouble maintaining a force of volunteers. Every single person's a volunteer. We do not need to use compulsion to get people to come in the armed services. We got an ample number of talented, skillful, courageous, dedicated young men and women willing to serve. And it's false.''

Service in our armed forces is one of the most honorable ways anyone can serve this Nation, and our military is attracting very good people. However, in a society that prides itself on individual liberty and personal freedom, public service is not the only way to serve the common good. A free country should never force anyone to work for the government unless there is no other reasonable alternative.

We can teach our children to love and appreciate this country without forcing any young person to serve in the military against his or her will. There are plenty of professions where people honorably serve others, a good many of which are in the private sector.

Farmers serve this Nation well providing food for the people. Bankers serve the Nation well by creating the capital and financing for small businesses to create jobs and hire hard-working people.

Nurses and doctors serve the Nation well by working long hours protecting us from disease and injury.

Farmers, doctors, teachers, business people—these are just a few of the countless people in countless professions who work hard at honest jobs serving others in service to this Nation.

For every person we force into the military against his or her wishes, we are taking away the ability of that individual to fulfill the God-given right to pursue one's own happiness, a right that Thomas Jefferson made the centerpiece of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that neither the administration nor the Republican leadership in Congress is willing to face the facts. The reckless rush to war in Iraq without being prepared to win the peace has put our troops seriously at risk. We have a situation that continues to deteriorate on the ground in Iraq. We are forcing young men and women to stay in the military and are exerting inordinate pressure to extend their enlistments. Finally, we are reducing the qualifications of new recruits into the military. This is all a desperate attempt to maintain our inadequate troop strength levels.

Rather than acknowledge the problems and deal with responsible proposals that have been offered by a number of our colleagues, the Republican leadership has instead advanced to the floor legislation to reinstate the draft which they do not even support.

It is time to stop playing games with the welfare of the young men and women that are serving us in Iraq and around the world. They deserve better. They deserve proper equipment and an increase in our overall troop level. They need leadership in the White House and in Congress to help stabilize and reverse the perilous situation into which they have been thrust, against the best advice of uniformed leadership.

I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation and to provide a responsible alternative to increasing the troop level and increasing the range and nature of support from other countries. Sadly, it appears that this White House, the current Secretary of Defense and the Republican leadership in Congress are not equal to the task at hand. Hopefully, after November we will be given a new opportunity to address these critical issues.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 163 in the strongest possible terms. The draft, whether for military purposes or for some form of ''national service,'' violates the basic moral principles of individual liberty upon which this country was founded. Furthermore, the military neither wants nor needs a draft.

The Department of Defense, in response to calls to reinstate the draft has confirmed that conscription serves no military need. Defense officials from both parties have repudiated the need to reinstate the draft. For example, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has said

that, "The disadvantages of using compulsion to bring into the armed forces the men and women needed are notable," while President William Clinton's Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera, in a speech before the National Press Club, admitted that, "Today, with our smaller, post-Cold War armed forces, our stronger volunteer tradition and our need for longer terms of service to get a good return on the high, up-front training costs, it would be even harder to fashion a fair draft."

However, the most important reason to oppose H.R. 163 is that a draft violates the very principals of individual liberty upon which our nation was founded. Former President Ronald Reagan eloquently expressed the moral case against the draft in the publication Human Events in 1979: ". . . [conscription] rests on the assumption that your kids belong to the State. If we buy that assumption then it is for the State—not for parents, the community, the religious institutions or teachers—to decide who shall have what values and who shall do what work, when, where and how in our society. That assumption isn't a new one. The Nazis thought it was a great idea."

Some say the 18 year old draftee "owes it" to his (or her, since N.R. 163 makes woman eligible for the draft) country. Hogwash! It just as easily could be argued that a 50 year-old chicken-hawk, who promotes war and places the danger on innocent young people, owes more to the country than the 18 year-old being denied his (or her) liberty.

All drafts are unfair. All 18 and 19 year olds are never drafted. By its very nature a draft must be discriminatory. All drafts hit the most vulnerable young people, as the elites learn quickly how to avoid the risks of combat.

Economic hardship is great in all wars and cannot be minimized. War is never economically beneficial except for those in position to profit from war expenditure. The great tragedy of war is that is enables the careless disregard for civil liberties of our own people. Abuses of German and Japanese Americans in World War I and World War II are well known.

But the real sacrifice comes with conscription—forcing a small number of young vulnerable citizens to fight the wars that older men and women, who seek glory in military victory without themselves being exposed to danger, promote. The draft encourages wars with neither purpose nor moral justification and that are too often not even declared by the Congress.

Without conscription, unpopular wars are difficult to fight. Once the draft was undermined in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Vietnam War came to an end. But most importantly, liberty cannot be preserved by tyranny. A free society must always resort to volunteers. Tyrants think nothing of forcing men to fight and serve in wrongheaded wars. A true fight for survival and defense of America would elicit, I am sure, the assistance of every able-bodied man and woman. This is not the case for wars of mischief far away from home in which we have experienced often in the past century.

A government that is willing to enslave some of its people can never be trusted to protect the liberties of its own citizens. I hope all my colleagues join me in standing up for individual liberty and to shut down this un-American relic of a bygone era and help realize the financial savings and the gains to individual liberties that can be achieved by ending Selective Service registration.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, it must be an election year, because the fear mongering is in full swing.

President George W. Bush has repeatedly said he doesn't intend to revive the draft, because he believes that the military is more effective and less expensive as an all-volunteer force than it would be under a draft. Yet that hasn't stopped his critics, who are waging a behind-the-scenes campaign to frighten the American people.

The truth is this: President Bush has no "secret plan" to reinstitute the draft, and the only measure that would do so is the one we are considering today—offered by members of Senator KERRY's party and cosponsored solely by the minority party.

I concur with the Pentagon's assessment that the all-volunteer force has provided a military "that is experienced, smart, disciplined and representative of America." Volunteer soldiers are more family-oriented, career-oriented and stay longer. Lastly, there is no need for a draft at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, and its overwhelming rejection today by the Members of the House will put to rest the spin that is being offered by those merely interested in frightening voters during an election year. I urge my colleagues to join me in denouncing these tactics and voting against this bill.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill to reinstate a military draft in the United States. It is unfortunate that we find ourselves in this position . . . but it is not a matter of needing a draft . . . this administration has not managed our resources and our troops well.

We went into the Iraq war with no exit strategy, and the current military reinforcements are coming from the administration's backdoor draft via calling the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) back into service. The IRR are those who have already fulfilled their active duty service requirement to the United States.

The Nation does not need a draft for an all-volunteer force. We need to wisely and effectively manage or troops and our resources in the theater. Charging into Iraq with insufficient troop numbers—against the advise of the Army Chief of Staff—and allowing an insurgency to fester, have combined to put our troops in far more danger than need be.

Even our distinguished former U.S. civilian administrator in Iraq, L. Paul Bremer, said just yesterday that the United States "paid a big price" for not having enough troops on the ground after we overthrew Saddam Hussein.

Bremer said when he arrived to head the U.S.-led Coalition Provisional Authority in Baghdad in early May, 2003, there was already "horrid" looting occurring. I agree with Ambassador Bremer when he goes on to say: "We paid a big price for not stopping it because it established an atmosphere of lawlessness. We never had enough troops on the ground."

Now, our current method of retaining a list of people for the Selective Service, for registration only, is important tool to retain should we ever need an enormous, rapid infusion of manpower in the military.

Let me say to my colleague from New York, Mr. RANGEL, our distinguished friend who introduced this bill to illustrate the point that many of our service men and women today are in the military because they have very few economic choices in their lives. I join you in urging all the sons and daughters of America, rich and poor, to be part of the uniformed service. We cannot have one class of Americans to fight our wars and another class of Americans benefiting from those wars.

Freedom isn't free—for any of us.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a politically motivated diversion. It is not well conceived . . . it did not get a hearing in our House Armed Services Committee and it's not a serious attempt—for if it were, it would have gone through our process here and would not be destined for defeat as a "non-controversial" bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill now under consideration, H.R. 163.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 163.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have not voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 163, will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2929, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5011.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 2, nays 402, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—2

Murtha
Stark

NAYS—402

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn

Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Boehlert
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Cannon
Cox
DeMint
Dooley (CA)
Forbes
Gephardt
Greenwood
Hoeffel
John
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Majette
McIntyre
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Nethercutt
Norwood
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Sandlin
Slaughter
Tauzin
Terry

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1929

Mrs. CUBIN and Messrs. EMANUEL, PORTER, DOOLITTLE, DELAHUNT, SHERMAN, RADANOVICH and BASS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 494, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

SECURELY PROTECT YOURSELF AGAINST CYBER TRESPASS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2929, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2929, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo