

□ 1145

STATES' RIGHTS AND MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to respect the rights of States that have governed in an area for over 30 years.

This House will consider H.R. 5 tomorrow. This legislation does nothing more than attempt to impose Congress' will on States without giving them the opportunity to draft their own solutions to this problem.

Medical malpractice is a problem. Insurance rates are a problem. Availability is a problem. But our States have dealt with this issue for almost 30 years now, and I know that in Texas the State legislature is considering a piece of legislation now. In fact, in 37 States, States are considering legislation now.

State legislatures have always been the laboratories for successful legislation. They are best positioned to determine how to address the medical malpractice situation in these States. These lawsuits are filed in State courts, not in Federal courts. H.R. 5, however, ignores the hard work being done by our States and imposes a one-size-fits-all, Washington-knows-best approach; and that is not the way to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues who consider themselves defenders of States' rights to oppose H.R. 5 tomorrow and let the State legislatures do their job.

ALLOW MIGUEL ESTRADA A FAIR VOTE

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 years ago President Bush nominated Miguel Estrada to fill a vacancy in the United States Court of Appeals. During this time, the President's opponents have turned "advise and consent" into "criticize and dissent." They have stalled nearly all of his judicial nominations and much of his domestic agenda as well.

The President's opponents are purposely relegating important legislation to their "criticize and dissent" penalty box. This filibuster is not about Miguel Estrada. He is qualified to serve, and everybody knows that. No, sadly, this is a part of a larger plot to shut down our lawmaking process in an effort to score political points.

With terrorists knocking at our door, gas and heating prices soaring, an economy in need of a jump-start, they want to tie up the vital business of America with a filibuster against Miguel Estrada. And it will not end with Miguel Estrada. They will continue to obstruct at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opponents to allow Miguel Estrada a fair vote, return to the crucial work for which they were elected, and set free the legislative process they are holding hostage.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Members are reminded not to make inappropriate statements about the Senate.

DO NOT CUT IMPACT AID TO SCHOOLS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the President's proposal to drastically cut Impact Aid to schools.

The need has been clear for over half a century. Begun in 1950, Impact Aid compensates districts for the loss of taxes that support schools. Military land and the military homes located on that land do not pay property taxes.

But the administration would cut funding for children living off base, even though the compensation rate is much lower. Yet taxes are also lost from these families. Over three-quarters of servicemembers living in my district claim residence in other States and do not pay State income or car registration taxes. Sales at commissaries or exchanges on bases are exempt from State sales taxes. Property, income, and sales taxes are all needed to pay for education.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as members of our armed services are deploying in large numbers to prepare for a possible war, it is critical for them to know that their children's schools are being supported by the very country for whom they are prepared to give their lives.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, long ago it was written, "Choose this day whom you will serve."

Today, as we go about the people's business in this House of Representatives, in another body on the east coast of this country, an international security council meets and makes decisions about who the United Nations will serve in these momentous times.

Will the United Nations be a cover for tyrants and for nations who give them succor and support, or will the United Nations fulfill its historic mission and be about the business of advancing freedom in the world, confronting tyranny in the world, sup-

porting civil liberties and basic human rights?

It is time for the U.N. to choose. But as the members of that historic body meet this very week and make these momentous decisions, let them know that in this Congress, after these times have passed, we will debate and we will decide and we will choose the metes and bounds of the commitment of the United States of America to the United Nations.

NEW LEVEL OF BUFFOONERY

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this House reached a new level of buffoonery yesterday when one of the Members here used his authority to require vendors to rename French toast and that famous Belgian delicacy, French fries, saying this would "show support for the American troops protecting freedom abroad."

Now, Mr. Speaker, having been a "troop," I do not think many people are going to have their morale raised much by us calling it "freedom toast."

President Chirac's efforts to find a way to disarm Saddam without getting American troops killed is not an act of effrontery or hatred toward the United States.

I could recite a whole long litany of French contributions to our military goals, from providing the majority of troops at Yorktown, to voting with us more than 98 percent of the time in the Security Council, and we all know that France has been our longest and strongest ally.

We could take that picture down over there of Mr. Lafayette. He fought at Yorktown. Why not really be silly and make ourselves laughingstocks?

Mr. Speaker, let us stop putting this kind of silliness out and demeaning our relationship with the French.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S PRO-GROWTH, PRO-JOBS TAX PROPOSAL

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support a pro-growth, pro-jobs plan. The President's tax proposal is critical to our Nation's economic health. Critics describe tax relief for working families, small businesses, and investors as a "cost" we cannot afford. Viewing this as a cost is shortsighted and simply bad economic theory.

If we look at the reality of the President's proposal, the reality of what tax relief will do, we know that this plan will generate enough jobs and tax revenues to reduce the so-called costs by 56.8 percent.

A key component of the President's plan for growth is dividend tax relief. If

anyone doubts the need or wisdom of such a cut, I would refer them to a recent Washington Post commentary by Charles Schwab, who said he "can't think of any other tax policy that would, at one stroke, be more beneficial to ordinary investors." He predicted immediate benefits, with a stock market rise of 10 to 15 percent. Debates about cost are simply missing the point.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear this plan will assist in jump-starting our economy. I encourage all my colleagues to join in passing this important legislation.

OPPOSE HEALTH ACT OF 2003

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called HEALTH Act of 2003.

The acronym in the title of this bill supposedly stands for Help Efficient, Accessible, Low Cost, Timely Healthcare. But close examination of the provisions of the bill leads me to the conclusion that the acronym instead spells Help Eviscerate Accountability by Law for Traumatic Harm.

Supporters of this bill claim that medical malpractice premiums are out of control because of excessively high-damage awards in malpractice suits. But paid losses have tracked consistently with medical inflation rates for the last 3 decades. There simply is no explosion of paid losses.

Furthermore, there is no provision in the bill, no provision, that requires insurers to lower their rates once the caps are in place.

Supporters of this bill make it plain whom they care for: insurance companies. And it is also clear where the losses will be: people injured due to medical negligence.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO PROMOTE JOB CREATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

(Mr. COX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, our economy needs new jobs. That is why I so strongly support President Bush's proposal to promote job creation and economic growth. One provision of that plan will lead to the creation of over 400,000 new jobs by the end of next year, and that is the proposal to eliminate the double tax on savings in stocks and mutual funds.

America's savers should be rewarded, not penalized, for investing, because when they invest their savings, they not only promote job creation, create the wherewithal for the hiring of new workers, but they also help provide for their own retirement. Indeed, those who are already retired stand to ben-

efit from the elimination of the double tax, because over half of dividend payments are received by senior citizens.

To get our economy growing again, to provide tax fairness to the men and women who are saving for their future retirement and those who are already on fixed incomes, it is time to repeal the double tax on savings.

DEBATE REAL ISSUES AND LEAVE JOKES TO COMEDIANS

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the debate over war and peace in this House has crumpled into farce. Yesterday, some of our colleagues held a press conference to announce that the House would now be serving "freedom fries" and "freedom toast" instead of French fries and French toast. So far, German chocolate cake, Russian salad dressing, and the entire Chinese food section have been spared the wrath of these culinary correctors.

Mr. Speaker, this episode would be funny if it were not so sad. Because of this stunt, the image of the House in the eyes of the American people and people around the world will diminish once again. This House should not be a punch line, Mr. Speaker; it should not be the butt of jokes on the "Tonight Show."

I hope that the Members who staged yesterday's circus enjoyed the publicity. I hope it was worth it.

We are about to go to war, Mr. Speaker. Let us have a real debate about real issues that affect the lives of real people and leave the jokes to the comedians.

CHILD MEDICATION SAFETY ACT OF 2003

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, last year the House Committee on Government Reform held a hearing exploring an issue that should shock all of us. Witnesses at the hearing testified that some school officials have taken it upon themselves to decide that a child needs to be placed on psychotropic drugs. These school officials are not licensed medical practitioners, and yet some of these officials have told parents that their child must be on a drug such as Ritalin, or their child would not be allowed to attend school any longer.

No child should face denial of educational services because they are not taking a psychotropic drug.

Last night, I introduced the Child Medication Safety Act of 2003. This legislation will address a significant problem facing children and their parents throughout the Nation and provide parents with protections from being forced

into making decisions about their child's health under duress.

This bill has a simple message: States that take Federal education funds must prevent school district personnel, teachers, principals, and other nonlicensed medical professionals from forcing a child to be on psychotropic drugs in order to attend school or receive services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

THE INADEQUACY OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as we speak, the House Committee on the Budget is marking up a budget resolution for this coming fiscal year. President Bush has proposed a budget that is \$304 billion in deficit, the biggest deficit ever submitted. And do you know, there is not one dime in that budget for waging war with Iraq, let alone any of the reconstruction costs that are necessary.

If you look out for the next 10 years, President Bush is suggesting that we should accumulate deficits of over \$5 trillion. Halfway through this next decade in 2008, the baby boom generation starts to retire, thereby doubling the number of people dependent upon Social Security and Medicare. Yet all of this \$5 trillion in deficit is going to have to be borrowed from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and there is not one dime for Iraq or for any of the other domestic priorities.

Think about the fact that this budget means that Veterans Administration hospitals will be able to treat 168,000 fewer veterans, that we will have to eliminate education for homeless children and after-school care.

Take a look at this budget and cry.

□ 1200

THE BUDGET

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enter into this discussion about the budget because I think it certainly is a worthy one in a time when our Nation has been attacked and is working hard against terrorism and to protect our domestic States from threats. We are at war.

The reality is this is what our budget does. From fiscal year 2002 to 2003, there was a 7 percent increase. From 2003 to 2004 it will be about a 3 percent increase, with about a 5.5 percent increase in defense and in homeland security; there will be increases in unemployment insurance because of the