

I urge my colleagues to support American seniors, to support the future of the Medicare program, and to support this Congress in one of the most promising endeavors I have ever been a part of in my years in this esteemed body. Join me in taking a bold step closer to consideration of this extraordinary legislation. I ask the Democrats, stop defeating these attempts, stop delaying help to our seniors, and stop destroying their trust in their government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

—————

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF
CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH
RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF
CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 458 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 458

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of November 21, 2003, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) A bill or joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, or any amendment thereto.

(2) A bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, any amendment thereto, or any conference report thereon.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 458 is a rule that waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to same-day consideration against certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. Specifically, this rule waives the requirement for a two-thirds majority vote in the House to consider a rule on the same day it has been reported by the Committee on Rules.

This rule's waiver applies to any special rule reported on the legislative day of November 21, 2003, providing for the consideration or disposition of any of the following:

A, a bill or joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 or any amendments thereto; or

B, a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, any amendment thereto or any conference reported thereon.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in approving H. Res. 458. Its passage will help expedite the consideration of either another continuing resolution, if that becomes needed, or even conference reports on the last few remaining fiscal year 2004 appropriations bills, including the Foreign Operations bill, Transportation-Treasury bill, the Agriculture bill, the VA-HUD bill, the Commerce-Justice bill, the District of Columbia bill, and the Labor-HHS bill.

I believe that we are in the waning days of this year's legislative session with only a relatively small number of must-do legislative items still left to finish. Approving this same-day waiver rule will help provide for prompt consideration of these important funding bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules approved this rule last night, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, marshal law rules like this one are symptomatic of the failure of this Republican government. Republicans are doing such harm to America, from Medicare and the economy to foreign policy and homeland security, that keeping the public in the dark has become their chief priority.

So today, Republican leaders are yet again waiving the rules of the House. Later today they plan to do it in order to force through their plan to end Medicare as we know it, which is how the chief author of the Republican Medicare bill describes their goal.

But first, Republican leaders want to pass this marshal law rule so that they can rush through a spending bill before Members, the press, and the public have had the chance to find out what is really in it.

Mr. Speaker, they will not even tell us which spending bill they plan to hide from us today. All we know is that it will either spend tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer money, or that it will spend hundreds of billions of dollars in taxpayer money. Either way, it will become law before it has even been read by anyone except for a handful of Republicans at the White House and in

the Congress. But since these are the same Republicans who have exploded the budget deficit to nearly \$500 billion, raising the debt tax on all Americans, no one has much faith in them anymore.

Mr. Speaker, after nearly a decade of controlling the Congress, the Republican Party's fundamental goal is simply protecting its own power by hiding from the public the damage they are doing to America. Of course, if you look at the Republican record, you can understand why they are so desperate to keep it hidden. In the nearly 3 years since George Bush became President, Republicans have created a whole host of problems for the American people.

On national security, the Bush administration has plunged this Nation into its worst foreign policy crisis since the end of the cold war because they would not trust the American people with the truth about Iraq and because they could not work with our allies around the world. And while U.S. taxpayers are spending hundreds of billions of dollars on Iraq, our homeland defense needs here in the United States remain dangerously unmet.

On domestic policy, of course, Republicans are going for the right wing gold. Later today they will try to finalize Newt Gingrich's dream of forcing Medicare to wither on the vine, shattering Medicare's nearly 40-year-old promise to American citizens. That debate, Mr. Speaker, will be a case study in the public dishonesty that is fundamental to the Republican government.

Over and over again, Republicans will repeat their poll-tested sound bytes. They will save Medicare reform and hope that millions of seniors do not notice the Republicans are forcing them out of traditional Medicare and into HMOs and insurance companies. They will talk about choice and ignore the fact that millions of seniors will lose the ability to choose their own doctors. And they will decry skyrocketing prescription prices and hope no one notices that they are actually protecting drug company profits by making it illegal for Medicare to negotiate lower prices for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans will wax poetic about the generosity of their drug benefit, hiding the fact that premiums and benefits will actually be set by HMOs and insurance companies; and that even under the Republicans' rosiest scenario, seniors with average drug bills will still have to pay about \$2,500 per year out of their own pockets. Of course, Republicans will not say a thing about the \$12 billion slush funds they are setting up for HMOs or insurance companies or the \$139 billion in windfall profits they are giving to the big drug companies.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the Republican Medicare bill does not take effect until after the election. Republican political strategists are desperately hoping that seniors do not discover this truth about this assault on Medicare before they go to the polls in 2004. But

make no mistake, when seniors sit down at their kitchen tables to pay their bills, they are going to do the math, and they are going to see that Republicans have sold them a very expensive and very harmful bill of goods.

Mr. Speaker, the false promise of the Republican Medicare plan will remind a lot of Americans of the false promise of the Republican economic plan. In less than 3 years, the Republicans have taken a historic budget surplus and turned it into a monumental deficit. They have done it through reckless fiscal irresponsibility and through an obsession with spending billions of taxpayer dollars for a small elite of the wealthiest few, people like the Bush campaign fund-raising Pioneers.

As a result, instead of using the budget surplus to help address priorities like skyrocketing prescription prices and strengthening Social Security and Medicare, Republicans have created a fiscal crisis and raised the debt tax on all Americans.

Along the way, nearly 3 million jobs have been lost, giving George W. Bush the worst job performance of any President since The Great Depression. Millions of families no longer share in the prosperity of the nineties. Of course, you would never know the facts if you just listened to Republican rhetoric. But talking points cannot cancel out the truth. And the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that Americans continue to be unemployed at alarmingly high rates. More than 2 million workers have been unable to find a job in this economy for more than 6 months, and many of them will lose their unemployment insurance over the holidays if this Republican Congress does not act this year before we adjourn.

□ 1645

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose the important parliamentary vote known as the previous question. That is the only way to ensure Republicans do not leave town for their own holiday vacations without providing unemployed Americans with the help they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are smarter than Republican leaders give them credit for. They know the difference between rhetoric and reality. So I urge my Republican friends to look past their leader's rhetoric and join me in providing real help to Americans suffering through this economy.

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to consider an additional continuing resolution which will allow us to go home over the holidays, and at this time, there is no indication from the

majority that they are prepared to bring up an extension of the unemployment insurance benefits for thousands of our fellow citizens who will be running out of unemployment insurance benefits during that period of time. So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would not approve the previous question so that we could bring up this unemployment insurance extension.

Let me just remind my colleagues that 1 year ago we were in a similar position, and the majority did not bring up an extension of the unemployment insurance benefits, and at Christmas-time, we had to tell hundreds of thousands of Americans that they ran the risk of losing the Federal benefits that they needed during this recession. We are faced with the situation again.

Two days after Christmas, the current Federal 13-week unextended benefit program is scheduled to expire. If we do not do anything about it, 80- to 90,000 people in this Nation, every week, will exhaust their State extended benefits and will not be entitled to any Federal extended benefits; 1.4 million Americans during that 6-month period, until June of next year, are anticipated would be without benefits.

The exhaustion rate, those who have exhausted their State unemployment benefits without finding employment has reached the highest level on record, the highest level on record, 43 percent. Two million workers have been unemployed for more than 6 months, nearly triple the amount compared to the beginning of 2001. We have 2.4 million fewer jobs today compared to 2½ years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader recently said, I see no reason to be extending unemployment compensation since every economic indicator is better off than in 1993 when the Democrats ended the Federal unemployment program. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from what the record shows, and I could go through a list of the economic indicators from the last downturn in our economy and this time, but this one I think really puts it all in proper perspective.

The current amount of jobs that were created before we terminated the Federal unemployment benefits in the 1990s was 2.9 million additional jobs. What we are looking at now is 2.4 million less jobs in this recession. The majority leader refers to some slight job growth that we had, and we hope that continues, because, currently, if someone's looking for a job, there are three people looking for every job that is available today. These are people who cannot find employment, but the loss of employment in our economy in the last couple of years is 2.4 million jobs. The jobs are not there. People want work. They cannot find work. That is why we have the Federal unemployment benefit program.

There is \$20 billion in the fund today to fund this program. The money is there. The money is there for this purpose. We should extend it before we go

home. So I hope we will use this opportunity because, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any other opportunities coming along. This may be our last chance by using this vehicle so that we can consider legislation that would extend the Federal unemployment benefits for some additional weeks, and by the way, we should also take care of those who have already exhausted all their benefits.

The economy just is not there yet. We all hope we will get there. We usually do this on a bipartisan basis. Let us get together and help our uninsured.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and I want to say to the Republicans, do not think this is a procedural vote on the previous question. This is a vote of substance. This is a vote questioning whether my colleagues will agree to bring up an unemployment compensation extension program.

As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) said, the majority leader stated, "I see no reason to be extending unemployment compensation since every economic indicator is better than in 1993 when the Democrats ended the Federal unemployment program." He could not be further from the truth.

If we do not act, 90,000 a week who are out of work, exhausting their benefits, will be out in the cold; 90,000 a week, 350,000 more or less a month, and they will join the 1.4 million long-term unemployed in this country, and the percentage of unemployed workers who have exhausted their benefits, contrary to what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has said, will reach an all-time high, almost 44 percent, and even with this modest increase in jobs the last couple of months, the U.S. economy still has 2.4 million fewer jobs today than 2½ years ago.

I want to refer to Michigan. The unemployment figures just came out: 7.6 is the unemployment rate, a 3-year high, an 11-year high, actually, and higher than when the temporary unemployment program was set up.

So this is not a test on procedure. This is a test whether my colleagues will stand with those who are unemployed, looking for work or turn a cold shoulder to them. There is nothing compassionate about this kind of action, conservatism or anything else.

So I urge all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to vote no on the previous question and stand up for those millions of Americans, millions who are looking for work, who cannot find it, who want not charity but unemployment compensation that they worked for. Vote no on the previous question.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to observe the lesson I just learned from the gentleman from Michigan. When President Clinton ran for President, he said we had the worst economy in 50 years, and just a few months later, he turned everything around. Things were so wonderful that he could stop unemployment compensation. I had not realized he had done it so quickly.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, several times this week the House has used emergency procedures to pass partisan legislation.

Yesterday, the Congress found time to give tax credits to Wal-Mart, but the Republican majority refuses to consider what is truly an emergency to millions of families, the fact that they do not have jobs, and millions of these workers are about to run out of unemployment insurance.

Last year, the same thing happened. The Republican Congress left town about Christmastime without extending the temporary program that provides employment benefits, leaving hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers to worry over the holidays about whether they were going to get the unemployment benefits that they had been expecting.

We have heard it has been reported that the majority leader said, "I see no reason to be extending unemployment compensation since every economic indicator is better than in 1993 when the Democrats ended the Federal unemployment program." Mr. Speaker, the esteemed majority leader does not know what he is talking about.

Washington State's unemployment is still among the highest in the Nation. It has grown for two solid years as we felt the brunt of the Bush recession. If the Congress does not extend the Federal program that provides unemployment compensation and fix a technical flaw in the Federal-State extended benefits program, over 83,000 workers in my State will stop, at Christmastime, receiving unemployment benefits.

I know the economy created 100,000 jobs last month, but 150,000 jobs must be created each month to maintain the employment rate because our population continues to grow.

Two days after Christmas, the temporary Federal unemployment benefits program is scheduled to expire, denying benefits to nearly 90,000 workers every single week. The unemployment picture today simply is not much better than it was last year, Mr. Speaker.

According to the Department of Labor, there is still only one job opening for every three unemployed work-

ers. In other words, of the 9 million unemployed American workers, 6 million of them have no chance of finding a job in the current economic climate.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that Congress can consider an emergency that faces millions of families, the Nation's unemployment problem.

It is Thanksgiving for heaven's sakes, and we are not even going to provide them a turkey at Thanksgiving or at Christmastime. That is really Scrooge, and it is really hard-hearted.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, WA, November 13, 2003.

Hon. JIM McDERMOTT,
*House of Representatives, Longworth Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDERMOTT: This letter is in response to your request (dated November 7, 2003) for unemployment projections and data.

Washington State's Seasonally Adjusted Total Unemployment Rate (SATUR) remained at 7.5 percent for the month of September, and this percentage is 116 percent of the same rate two years ago, keeping the State of Washington in a period of Extended Benefits (EB). The next issuance of the SATUR numbers is scheduled for November 21, 2003. Our forecast for October still shows that the State of Washington will again be above the required 110 percent of the same period for either of the past two years, and will remain in EB status for that period as well. Statistics due out on December 19, 2003 are indicating that the 110 percent criteria will not be met, and we would thus be out of EB for weeks after January 10, 2004.

Tables 1 and 2, enclosed, provide SATUR forecasts through calendar year 2005. As shown, the State of Washington Forecast Council estimates that the State of Washington's SATUR will remain above 6.5 percent through 2005.

Table 3 provides a count of claimants exhausting all benefits, by entitlement, for the first six months of 2003. Unemployment statistics are very cyclical and we believe the exhaustion rates for the first six months of 2004 will be very similar to those of 2003. Claimants exhausting Regular UI benefits become eligible for the TEUC program and claimants exhausting TEUC become eligible for the EB program. If the TEUC program were not continued, we estimate that close to 54,000 claimants would be without benefits in the first six months of 2004. Additionally, if the EB program were to end in January of 2004 due to the "look-back" provision, an additional 28,508 claimants exhausting the TEUC program would be without benefits.

Table 4 provides a summary of total dollars paid out to claimants by month and entitlement, for the first six months of 2003. Similar to exhaustion rates, we believe that payment totals will be very similar in 2004. We estimate that we would pay \$282 million out under the TEUC program and close to \$83 million under the EB program.

Also enclosed for your information is an additional fact sheet on current unemployment insurance data.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions, or if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ANNETTE M. COPELAND,
Assistant Commissioner.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, Congress has one last opportunity to provide unemployment benefits for Americans who have lost their jobs and been unable to find new jobs.

It is quite astounding. We at this point have what is called a jobless recovery. In my State, tens of thousands of people are unable to find employment with their benefits exhausted or near exhaustion. Across America it is millions.

I know budgets are tight around here. I know that Congress can afford to borrow money to pay Iraqis for no-show jobs, but the President says we cannot afford to spend down the \$20 billion balance in the Unemployment Trust Fund, taxes paid by employers and employees, for just such a situation. So we cannot afford that. We cannot afford to spend that. We can borrow money to send to Iraq, but we cannot spend down the trust fund for unemployed Americans.

□ 1700

Is he saying it is their fault they are unemployed? Is he saying he does not care they are unemployed? Is he saying he does not care they might lose their home; they cannot feed their kids; they cannot afford essentials; they cannot even buy gas for the car to go out and look for work; that they are having their phones shut off?

I am getting those kinds of calls. We have the highest unemployment rate in the United States in Oregon. It is chronic. And there are a lot of people who want to work and cannot find jobs. The least this Nation could do would be to help them with a modest extension of unemployment benefits.

Now, this is not the first time this has happened. Last year, Congress skipped out of town, the President did not raise any concern, and unemployment benefits expired for millions of Americans. This year, we are confronted with the same situation. Two days after Christmas, Merry Christmas, 90,000 workers will lose their extended unemployment benefits and have no income, and yet they cannot find a job. And it will be 90,000 workers a week. In 6 months, 2.2 million Americans will have lost everything, probably their homes, maybe their families, because this kind of breaks up families.

This is, of course, a family-friendly Republican majority and White House, but they just do not seem to care about these people wanting and needing jobs. Their jobs are being exported and have disappeared in the jobless recovery, or whatever. They cannot find work. In my State, it will be 43,000 people by February who will lose benefits.

Now, there is \$20 billion, that is 20,000 million dollars, in the Unemployment Trust Fund. We do not even have to borrow the money to give Americans a little bit of help to stay in their homes and keep their families together. We do

not have to borrow it because they pay the taxes, their employers pay the taxes. All the President has to do is say, I think that is a good idea, and the Republican majority will jump to it. We could do it right here, now, on the floor, by voting "no" and bringing that bill up today.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this bill.

While Congress dithers in what is probably the waning days of the first session of the 108th Congress, it is inexcusable that we are considering adjournment without first passing an extension of unemployment benefits for the millions of American workers who are currently jobless. In my home State of Oregon, the unemployment rate is still 7.6 percent, nearly 2 percentage points higher than the U.S. average. Even that number, though, is misleading, since it only counts the workers who are still looking for work. It does not include those people who have been off work, who no longer receive unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is inexcusable and unconscionable that the bill offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), is not being brought to the floor right now. Instead, the Republican leadership has chosen to force a vote on a 2-day CR because they are unable to fund the government by passing appropriation bills on time and in regular order.

Let me tell you just a little bit about these people who are looking for work, Mr. Speaker. These are people who are out of work through no fault of their own. They go out every single day and look for a job. One gentleman said to me that it is like playing musical chairs. He says, I go in, I think I have this wonderful resume, I meet all of the criteria, and I go in and there are 200 people that all have the same qualifications to meet that job. So he said it is a little bit like playing musical chairs with 200 people in the room and only one chair.

One woman told me she had to sell her home. She has been looking for work every day. She has sold her home and is living off the profits of her home. She does not know what she is going to do when those run out.

Another gentleman said, I have been trying to reeducate myself, so every day I am out looking for work. He said, I just feel like if I can just hold on for a little longer that job is going to be there.

Let us tide over the 90,000 Americans per week who will lose their unemployment benefits by the end of this year. Congress can and should pass an extension that will allow workers who are seeking employment to provide for their most basic needs as the holidays approach. Let us get on with this. Let us extend those unemployment benefits.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Rules that outlines some of the bases for our request for more time to evaluate the bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, Nov. 19, 2003.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: For the second time this week we are forced to write to you to protest the fact that the Republican majority will bring to the House floor a conference report on a major legislative proposal of enormous impact on every single American and is more than likely to do so without giving the Members of the House the opportunity to know what is in the bill. We are referring, of course, to the conference agreement on Medicare which we understand will be filed at some point today, this evening, or perhaps sometime in the wee hours of the morning.

Given our experience with the modus operandi of the Republican House Leadership, we believe we can safely assume that once that conference agreement has been filed the Rules Committee will convene in short order to report a rule. We must protest in the strongest possible terms. To bring this legislation to the Rules Committee in the middle of the night or at seven o'clock in the morning is a gross distortion and perversion of the legislative process and any sense of fairness to the Members of this institution and to the American people. Further, bringing this legislation to the floor while the ink is still drying on the paper, would renege on the promise made by the Speaker of the House in response to a letter signed by 41 Members of the Republican Conference who requested that the text of the Conference Report, its joint explanatory statement, and the CBO cost estimate be made available for three days before its consideration.

That letter reads: "We write to request if the Conferees on the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003 report to the House a Conference Report, copies of the text of the Conference Report, the text of the explanatory statement, and the text of the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for the Conference report be made available to all Members at least three calendar days after filing (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, unless the House is in session on those days) and prior to consideration of the Conference Report or to any measure reported from the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of the Conference Report."

"The general public will evaluate not only what Congress does regarding Medicare and prescription drugs, but the way in which it does it. A bill proposing such substantive changes to the Medicare system and costing an estimated \$400 billion over the next decade deserves the careful and thoughtful consideration of all Members."

As has been publicly reported, at a meeting of the Republican Conference on October 30 Speaker Hastert assured these members that they would indeed have three days to review the bill as they had requested. From the November 3, 2003 edition of Roll Call: "So last Thursday, at a GOP Conference meeting that was called exclusively to update Members on the Medicare talks, Hastert assured his

troops that they would now get regular briefings on the Medicare bill and would have at least three days to look over the conference report before having to vote on it, according to several Members who attended. . . 'The Speaker wants to make sure that Members are comfortable making this historic change' to Medicare, said Hastert spokesman John Feehery."

On November 7, Congress Daily reported on the Speaker's promise: ". . . time is required for those outside the room to look over what everyone agrees are the most sweeping changes being made to Medicare in a generation. 'The thing I'm happiest about is we get three days with the language,' said Rep. Charlie Norwood, R-GA, referring to a promise made by House Speaker Hastert." Clearly, this was a promise that Members of the Republican Conference felt would be kept.

On November 12, at a symposium on the modern day Speaker of the House, Speaker Hastert outlined his own set of principles that guide him in his work: "When you are Speaker, people expect you to keep your word, and they will not quickly forgive you if you cannot deliver. I've learned that keeping your word is the most important part of this job. You are better off not saying anything than making a promise that you cannot keep. And you have to keep both the big promises and the small promises."

We believe the Speaker to be a man of honor and a man who lives up to the high-minded principles he outlined in his speech. Yet, yesterday it was reported in Congress Daily that the Majority Leader—who had previously said that Members would have three full days to look over the agreement—said that the clock had started running on Sunday.

Mr. Chairman, on Sunday there was an announcement that an agreement had been reached and a summary of the agreement was posted on the Web; but as of today, no finalized text of the bill, the joint explanatory statement of managers, or the CBO cost estimate have been released to Members of the House.

If the Rules Committee convenes at some point today or early tomorrow morning to pave the way for the consideration of this conference report, the Republican Leadership will have shown that political expediency, rather than the wishes of its own Members and the promise of the Speaker of the House, is what drives its agenda. Perhaps your Leadership can mollify these Members who wrote to the Speaker making a reasonable and rational request. Perhaps Members of the Republican Conference will agree to vote for a rule without ever knowing what is really in this bill. But we would consider that to be a sad turn of events, Mr. Chairman, and we would urge you to object to this process if for no other reason than to protect the prerogatives of Members of Congress to have the opportunity to understand what they are voting for or against.

Mr. Chairman, once again House Democratic conferees were deliberately excluded from negotiations on major legislation. Chairman Thomas stated on more than one occasion when asked about the Medicare conference that there was no reason to include anyone who did not want to reach an agreement. We believe what he really meant to say was there was no reason to include anyone in the negotiations who would not agree with him or the other Republican conferees. This attitude seems to pervade the manner in which this institution is being run and the fact that an agreement of this magnitude few people have seen will be rushed to

the floor for a vote only adds to this perception. May we remind you that perception often become reality?

We are perfectly aware that our protests will most likely fall on deaf ears. But, for the sake of this institution and the United States, we urge you to ensure that the Republican Leadership keeps the promise made by the Speaker of the House.

We look forward to a response at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

MARTIN FROST.
JIM MCGOVERN.
LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER.
ALCEE L. HASTINGS.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out on the Medicare bill, getting back to that, that by not having time to review it and perhaps correct some of the technicalities, whether one thinks this is a good benefit or not, I am sure that many of my colleagues on the right take the same view as I do about privacy, and particularly privacy of our personal financial records.

I am sure that most of them are unaware that private contractors will now be able to willy nilly get tax returns from anybody who may be required to pay a higher premium under the income-adjusted premiums. This means that for the first time in the history of the Internal Revenue Code, we are making available personal tax information to private enterprise operators at will, and I am not sure my colleagues want to do that.

I hope our friends on the right will think about it and think about what unscrupulous folks might do with private personal tax information, which has been one of the bedrock principles of privacy in this country. And I would like to think that the Republicans would not support that. But they do not know what is in this bill. The chairman does not know what is in the bill. And I would submit that the members of the Committee on Rules do not know what is in the bill.

To vote in that kind of ignorance is an affront to the principles, if you have any, which you might stand for.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the dean of our Texas delegation for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, martial law rules, it is interesting to note, always come up in the later part of the session because we always want to get finished. We did a martial law on Medicare so we could pass a 600-page document without having to digest it. Now we have a continuing resolution martial law.

But I really want to talk about the prescription drug provision in Medicare, because that is what will come up later. Our Houston Chronicle wrote an interesting editorial today which talks about the "scribbled prescription" in the bill that we are going to consider as an "intended cure could be worse than Medicare disease." It talks about

the provisions of this bill we are going to consider tonight is stingy because it does not begin until 2006; and that there is such a donut hole in the middle that people will lose, if they have \$300 a month in prescription drugs, because they will fall into that donut hole. So it is stingy.

The critics point out that providing a drug component to Medicare encourages businesses to dump their retirees. I had a constituent call me the other day from a utility company who said he was worried his retiree benefits for prescription drugs would be cut. And I said unless you have a collective bargaining agreement, that could happen.

A concern I have, as they quote in the Chronicle editorial, is that the "AARP, the most powerful senior citizen organization, has endorsed" this proposal. Again, I am quoting the Houston Chronicle, "But, as the plan before Congress offers such limited help for seniors with high prescription costs, it's no wonder so many people believe AARP's decision was motivated more by its own political dealmaking than concern for its 35 million members' best interests." And that is a direct quote.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress, a prescription drug bill was the goal, to pass something; but this bill actually goes in the wrong direction. It prohibits Medicare from negotiating for lower prices. HMOs do it, the Veterans Administration does it, companies do it; and yet now we are prohibiting Medicare from doing it by law. That ought to outrage our seniors, including those 35 million AARP members.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 28 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will provide that immediately after the House passes this resolution, it will take up legislation to extend the Federal unemployment insurance that is set to expire for new enrollees just 2 days after Christmas.

This legislation would continue the extended unemployment insurance program through the first 6 months of next year. The bill would also increase to 26 weeks the amount of benefits provided under that program, up from 13 weeks. This would provide new help to the 1.4 million workers who have already exhausted their extended benefits and have yet to find work.

This measure is identical to the text of H.R. 3244, the Rangel-Cardin unemployment extension; and it also contains the text of H.R. 3554, sponsored

by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), which would fix a flaw in current law that penalizes people in States with exceptionally high long-term unemployment rates by preventing them from receiving the unemployment benefits they need.

Here is why it is needed, Mr. Speaker. Americans continue to be unemployed at alarmingly high rates. The percentage of Americans exhausting their unemployment benefits without finding a job has reached its highest level on record. More than 2 million workers have been unemployed for more than 6 months. These Americans need relief, and they need it immediately. If we do not fix this today, over 400,000 jobless Americans will not be eligible for unemployment compensation after the first of the year.

Mr. Speaker, it appears likely that Congress will adjourn sine die within the next few days. This will very likely be the only opportunity we have to help unemployed Americans this year. Let us not abandon them today.

Let me make very clear that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of this resolution for consideration of the appropriations items, but a "no" vote will allow the House to vote on legislation to help provide some much-needed relief to our Nation's unemployed workers, some relief that might be nice during the upcoming holiday season.

Again, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule, so we can hopefully have an appropriation bill later this evening or this weekend we can vote on and finish things up.

The text of the amendment previously referred to by Mr. FROST, is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 458—RULE ON WAIVING 2/3RDS FOR C/R AND APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 2. "Immediately after disposition of this resolution, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3568) to provide extended unemployment benefits to displaced workers, and to make other improvements in the unemployment insurance system. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bills to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking Minority Member of the Committee on the Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

A FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1904) "An Act to improve the capacity of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to plan and conduct hazardous fuels reduction projects on National Forest System lands and Bureau of Land Management lands aimed at protecting communities, watersheds, and certain other at-risk lands from catastrophic wildfire, to enhance efforts to protect watersheds and address threats to forest and rangeland health, including catastrophic wildfire, across the landscape, and for other purposes."

CONTROLLING THE ASSAULT OF NON-SOLICITED PORNOGRAPHY AND MARKETING ACT OF 2003

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 877) to regulate interstate commerce by imposing limitations and penalties on the transmission of unsolicited commercial electronic mail via the Internet, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 877

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003", or the "CAN-SPAM Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Electronic mail has become an extremely important and popular means of communication, relied on by millions of Americans on a daily basis for personal and commercial purposes. Its low cost and global reach make it extremely convenient and efficient, and offer unique opportunities for the development and growth of frictionless commerce.

(2) The convenience and efficiency of electronic mail are threatened by the extremely rapid growth in the volume of unsolicited commercial electronic mail. Unsolicited

commercial electronic mail is currently estimated to account for over half of all electronic mail traffic, up from an estimated 7 percent in 2001, and the volume continues to rise. Most of these messages are fraudulent or deceptive in one or more respects.

(3) The receipt of unsolicited commercial electronic mail may result in costs to recipients who cannot refuse to accept such mail and who incur costs for the storage of such mail, or for the time spent accessing, reviewing, and discarding such mail, or for both.

(4) The receipt of a large number of unwanted messages also decreases the convenience of electronic mail and creates a risk that wanted electronic mail messages, both commercial and noncommercial, will be lost, overlooked, or discarded amidst the larger volume of unwanted messages, thus reducing the reliability and usefulness of electronic mail to the recipient.

(5) Some commercial electronic mail contains material that many recipients may consider vulgar or pornographic in nature.

(6) The growth in unsolicited commercial electronic mail imposes significant monetary costs on providers of Internet access services, businesses, and educational and nonprofit institutions that carry and receive such mail, as there is a finite volume of mail that such providers, businesses, and institutions can handle without further investment in infrastructure.

(7) Many senders of unsolicited commercial electronic mail purposefully disguise the source of such mail.

(8) Many senders of unsolicited commercial electronic mail purposefully include misleading information in the message's subject lines in order to induce the recipients to view the messages.

(9) While some senders of commercial electronic mail messages provide simple and reliable ways for recipients to reject (or "opt-out" of) receipt of commercial electronic mail from such senders in the future, other senders provide no such "opt-out" mechanism, or refuse to honor the requests of recipients not to receive electronic mail from such senders in the future, or both.

(10) Many senders of bulk unsolicited commercial electronic mail use computer programs to gather large numbers of electronic mail addresses on an automated basis from Internet websites or online services where users must post their addresses in order to make full use of the website or service.

(11) Many States have enacted legislation intended to regulate or reduce unsolicited commercial electronic mail, but these statutes impose different standards and requirements. As a result, they do not appear to have been successful in addressing the problems associated with unsolicited commercial electronic mail, in part because, since an electronic mail address does not specify a geographic location, it can be extremely difficult for law-abiding businesses to know with which of these disparate statutes they are required to comply.

(12) The problems associated with the rapid growth and abuse of unsolicited commercial electronic mail cannot be solved by Federal legislation alone. The development and adoption of technological approaches and the pursuit of cooperative efforts with other countries will be necessary as well.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC POLICY.—On the basis of the findings in subsection (a), the Congress determines that—

(1) there is a substantial government interest in regulation of commercial electronic mail on a nationwide basis;

(2) senders of commercial electronic mail should not mislead recipients as to the source or content of such mail; and

(3) recipients of commercial electronic mail have a right to decline to receive additional commercial electronic mail from the same source.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT.—The term "affirmative consent", when used with respect to a commercial electronic mail message, means that—

(A) the recipient expressly consented to receive the message, either in response to a clear and conspicuous request for such consent or at the recipient's own initiative; and

(B) if the message is from a party other than the party to which the recipient communicated such consent, the recipient was given clear and conspicuous notice at the time the consent was communicated that the recipient's electronic mail address could be transferred to such other party for the purpose of initiating commercial electronic mail messages.

(2) COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC MAIL MESSAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "commercial electronic mail message" means any electronic mail message the primary purpose of which is the commercial advertisement or promotion of a commercial product or service (including content on an Internet website operated for a commercial purpose).

(B) TRANSACTIONAL OR RELATIONSHIP MESSAGES.—The term "commercial electronic mail message" does not include a transactional or relationship message.

(C) REGULATIONS REGARDING PRIMARY PURPOSE.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue regulations pursuant to section 13 further defining the relevant criteria to facilitate the determination of the primary purpose of an electronic mail message.

(D) REFERENCE TO COMPANY OR WEBSITE.—The inclusion of a reference to a commercial entity or a link to the website of a commercial entity in an electronic mail message does not, by itself, cause such message to be treated as a commercial electronic mail message for purposes of this Act if the contents or circumstances of the message indicate a primary purpose other than commercial advertisement or promotion of a commercial product or service.

(3) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(4) DOMAIN NAME.—The term "domain name" means any alphanumeric designation which is registered with or assigned by any domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority as part of an electronic address on the Internet.

(5) ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS.—The term "electronic mail address" means a destination, commonly expressed as a string of characters, consisting of a unique user name or mailbox (commonly referred to as the "local part") and a reference to an Internet domain (commonly referred to as the "domain part"), whether or not displayed, to which an electronic mail message can be sent or delivered.

(6) ELECTRONIC MAIL MESSAGE.—The term "electronic mail message" means a message sent to a unique electronic mail address.

(7) FTC ACT.—The term "FTC Act" means the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(8) HEADER INFORMATION.—The term "header information" means the source, destination, and routing information attached to an electronic mail message, including the originating domain name and originating electronic mail address, and any other information that appears in the line identifying, or