COST DRIVERS. FOR EXAMPLE, HOW BENEFITS ARE CALCULATED, FOR EXAMPLE, IS ON THE TABLE: WHETHER OR NOT BENEFITS RISE BASED UPON WAGE INCREASE OR PRICE INCREASES.

THERE'S A SERIES OF PARTS OF THE FORMULA THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED, AND WHEN YOU COUPLE THAT, THOSE DIFFERENT COST DRIVERS, AFFECTING THOSE—CHANGING THOSE WITH PERSONAL ACCOUNTS, THE IDEA IS TO GET WHAT HAS BEEN PROMISED MORE LIKELY TO BE—OR CLOSER DELIVERED TO WHAT HAS BEEN PROMISED.

DOES THAT MAKE ANY SENSE TO YOU? IT'S KIND OF MUDDLED.

LOOKING AT A SERIES OF THINGS THAT CAUSE THE—LIKE, FOR EXAMPLE, BENEFITS ARE CALCULATED BASED UPON THE INCREASE OF WAGES, AS OPPOSED TO THE INCREASE OF PRICES. SOME HAVE SUGGESTED THAT WE CALCULATE—THE BENEFITS WILL RISE BASED UPON INFLATION, AS OPPOSED TO WAGE INCREASES...

THERE IS A REFORM THAT WOULD HELP SOLVE THE RED IF THAT WERE PUT INTO EFFECT. IN OTHER WORDS, HOW FAST BENEFITS GROW, HOW FAST THE PROMISED BENEFITS GROW, IF THOSE—if that growth is affected...

...IT WILL HELP ON THE RED.

'NUFF SAID!

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Kuhl of New York). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE NO FLY NO BUY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCarthy) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. McCarthy. Mr. Speaker, last month, the front pages of our Nation's newspapers contained chilling headlines: 'Terror Suspects Buying Firearms.'

At least 44 times in a 4-month period, people whom the FBI suspected of being members of terrorist groups tried to buy guns. In all but nine instances, the purchases were allowed to go through.

A background check of the would-be buyer found no automatic disqualification such as being a felon, an illegal immigrant, or deemed mentally defective. By then, there have been many more instances of suspected members of terrorist groups trying to buy these guns, but since the Justice Department destroys background check records after only 24 hours, we will never know.

So not only are we allowing suspected terrorists to arm themselves, we are destroying the records indicating how many guns they actually have bought. We are destroying critical intelligence in the war on terror, and suspected terrorists are exploiting our pre-9/11 gun laws.

The question many of my constituents ask me is: ‘Why are these people allowed to be able to buy guns in the first place?’

It defies common sense. We are at war. We saw what these terrorists are capable of armed with only box cutters purchased at a hardware store. Then why do we allow our enemies to buy firearms and ammunition within our own borders?

Since 9/11, we have adopted a multitude of new laws in the wake of the war. Just try to fly out of Reagan National Airport. No one is spared from the reach of these new laws. Senior citizens, children, and Members of the House have been subjected to routine inspection before boarding a commercial flight. It is an inconvenience perhaps for some, but if it prevents one terrorist from boarding a plane, it is a good law.

But our gun laws are dangerously out of step with the war on terror. Terrorists and their handlers are able to get their names off the list as quickly as possible. They would then be able to purchase firearms and ammunition. This is absolutely ridiculous.

Let me set the record straight. I am not out to take away the right of any law-abiding citizen from being able to buy a gun.

We need common-sense gun safety regulations that protect law-abiding gun owners, while making it tougher for criminals and terrorists to obtain guns. That is why I have introduced a bill that would deny those on the Transportation Security Administration's No Fly List from purchasing firearms.

Why the No Fly List? Granted, the No Fly List includes some law-abiding citizens who are on the list in error. But it is the only Federal terrorist watch list with a procedure to get in error. The No Fly List is the only watch list to have public scrutiny. Other lists without practical application may be just as inaccurate but afford no due process to those wrongly listed.

My bill will ensure that these people incorrectly listed on the No Fly will be able to get their names off the list as quickly as possible. They would then be able to complete their gun purchase, no questions asked. Again, an inconvenience for some but necessary steps to ensure terrorists are not buying guns in our country.

The Federal Government charged with finding out from terrorists should put at least as much effort into making sure terrorists and criminals are buying guns as what senior citizens and children might bring aboard a plane. We are at war, and the Federal Government has made it easier for our enemies to arm themselves.

I have written Attorney General Gonzales and asked him to endorse my bill. And if he cannot endorse it, I want to know why. I understand the Second Amendment concerns low-abiding civilians. But these laws can coexist with responsible people's rights to hunt and protect their families.

RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERSHIP IS A RIGHT OF ALL LAW-ABIDING AMERICANS, BUT WE ALSO HAVE TO TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT LAW-ABIDING AMERICANS FROM ACTS OF TERROR AND CRIME.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen, unfortunately, many, many acts of crime and gun violence in the last few weeks. Each week for the next several weeks now, I am going to bring this subject up. I know a lot of the American people think Democrats have given up on this issue. I promise the American people, I will continue with the fight for good gun safety laws to make this country safer.

□ 1930

In SUPPORT OF LIEUTENANT PANTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Kuhl of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Jones) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I spoke about Marine 2nd Lieutenant Ilario Pantano and his struggle to defend his actions in battle.

April of 2004 was a time of widespread violence from Iraqi insurgents. It was the deadliest month of the war.

On April 15, 2004, Lieutenant Pantano was faced with a very difficult decision. Just 3 days after he had witnessed a deadly ambush, his unit received a tip about a weapons stockpile. Leery of the tip, he led a unit of 40 men to the area and immediately noticed two Iraqis in a vehicle who appeared to be escaping the area.

After stopping the vehicle, he ordered the two Iraqis to search the vehicle themselves so as to avoid a booby trap for himself or the others under his command. Suddenly, he said, the two insurgents pivoted towards him after disobeying his command to stop, and in a split-second decision Lieutenant Pantano decided he had to fire his weapon to protect himself and his men.

It was not until 2½ months later that his radio operator mentioned the incident to another Marine, who then accused Lieutenant Pantano of murder. He now is facing charges of two counts of murder.

Mr. Speaker, I have met Lieutenant Pantano and his family. I have watched again and again the “Dateline” interview Stone Phillips conducted with Lieutenant Pantano, and I have researched this situation at length. I believe Lieutenant Pantano is truthful in his recollection of the events of April of 2004 and he was justified in his action while having to make a split-second battlefield decision.

I question why the radio operator would wait 2½ months to tell his report of the events if he really believed Lieutenant Pantano and his family had told a lie. Furthermore, as is noted in the “Dateline” video, the sergeant was never even present for the actual shooting. How can he make a
judgment call on something he did not see?

Mr. Speaker, I have put in a resolution, H. Res. 167, to support Lieutenant Pantano as he faces yet another difficult fight for his life. I hope that my colleagues in the House will take some time to read my resolution and look into this situation for themselves. I believe a great unfairness has occurred here; and as the United States House of Representatives, we stand by our brave men and women in uniform as they protect and serve our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I would like to say that there is a Web site that his mother has established. It is called defendthedefenders.org, and may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform and bless America.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

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

There was no objection.

CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a bowling ball weighs about 170 times the weight of a slice of sandwich bread. It does not take a physicist to see the mismatch between a bowling ball and a slice of bread. And it does not take a trade expert to see the economic mismatch between the United States and the nations that make up the Central American Free Trade Agreement; Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and El Salvador.

The way that CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, proponents talk, you would think Central America was one of the biggest economies in the Western Hemisphere. CAFTA nations are not only among the world’s poorest countries, they are among its smallest economies.

Think about this: this big trade agreement that President Bush wants, CAFTA, the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations is about that of Orlando, Florida. Trade pacts like NAFTA and CAFTA enable companies to exploit cheap labor in other countries, then import their products back to the U.S. under favorable terms. American companies outsource their jobs to Guatemala, outsource their jobs to China, outsource their jobs to Mexico. It costs American workers their jobs. It is the same old story.

Again, the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations is about that of Orlando, Florida. Trade pacts like NAFTA and CAFTA enable companies to exploit cheap labor in other countries, then import their products back to the U.S. under favorable terms. American companies outsource their jobs to Guatemala, outsource their jobs to China, outsource their jobs to Mexico. It costs American workers their jobs. It is the same old story.

The workers overseas get paid almost nothing, not able to raise their living standard. U.S. corporations make more money, American workers lose their jobs. It is the same old story.

By encouraging informed choices and wise financial decisions, our Nation’s consumers will have positive credit ratings, money management skills, and be on the road to a stable and prosperous life. They will be able to build homes, buy cars, finance educations, and start businesses. It is our goal to