



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2003

No. 123

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

September 9, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution to commend members of the United States Armed Forces for their services to the United States in the liberation of Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to commend the Third Infantry Division (Mechanized) of the United States Army for its role in the liberation of Iraq.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

MILITARY DEATH GRATUITY TAX REPEAL

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today because let me first explain the posters on my left and right are the faces of young men and women who have died fighting for freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan, and also, Mr. Speaker, I hold up a photograph of a young man from Connecticut whose name is Tyler Jordan, 6 years old. He has the American flag folded under his arm, and he is looking at the casket of his father who died for freedom. Gunny Sergeant Phillip Jordan from Connecticut died for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am on the floor today is that last year I introduced a bill that would repeal the tax on the death gratuity. The American military family receives when a loved one dies a small amount of money. It is \$6,000, and there is a tax on \$3,000 of the \$6,000. And last year we passed in a larger bill a repeal, and it was sent to the other body and they did nothing with it. This year again the House has passed the same language which was in H.R. 693, the Military Death Gratuity Tax Repeal, the bill I put in. It was put into a larger bill that went to the Senate, and they still have taken no action. Let me tell the Members what that means.

From September 11, 2001, to December 31, 2001, over 292 military were killed and their families paid a tax on the gift of their son or loved one fighting for freedom. That is absolutely horrible in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. And in the year 2002, 1,007 families had to pay a tax on the death of a loved one. Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we, the House, have done our part and we have sent to the other body legislation to repeal this tax. It is unacceptable that any family in this country who has a loved one who has died for freedom would get a bill tax due from Uncle Sam. And, Mr. Speaker, I am

calling on the House leadership to bring up H.R. 693, bring it to the floor as a stand-alone bill, let us pass it and send it over to the other body, because if we will do that, Mr. Speaker, I will go on every radio show I can get on, every TV show I can get on, and ask that we not leave this October/November without passing this bill to eliminate the tax on the death gratuity. \$6,000 is not enough. We need to raise that, but there is one thing we can do, take off the tax.

Again I hold up the photograph of this young man, Tyler Jordan, who gave his father to this country, and why in the world should his family, in the year 2004, get a tax due bill from Uncle Sam? Is not giving the life of a loved one fighting for freedom enough?

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I ask the House leadership, both Republican and Democrat, to join me and bring to the floor H.R. 693. Let us repeal this death tax and send it over to the other body, and let us put pressure on them to get it to the President so that the other Phillip Jordans throughout this country will not have a mother or father saying I owe Uncle Sam tax on the gift of my loved one.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I want to close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and I ask God in His loving way to hold in his arms those who have lost ones fighting for freedom, and I ask God to bless the American people, the House and Senate that we will do what is right. I ask God to give strength and wisdom to the President of the United States. And I ask God three times, please, God; please, God; please, God, continue to bless America.

WTO MINISTERIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8019

(Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have seen little press coverage in the United States of the World Trade Organization before its ministerial beginning this week in Cancun, Mexico. But around the globe, the WTO's 5th Ministerial is a big story. The divide between WTO nations about its future is coming into public view. At stake in Cancun is the future of the World Trade Organization and how it will implement corporate globalization. Success or failure depends on which side of the divide countries stand. Given that the most powerful countries of the WTO, partnering with the supposedly neutral WTO Secretariat, have set the meeting's agenda to suit their goals. There can be no good outcome.

The best result is what the U.S. media may report as a "failure." The small block of powerful nations fail to steamroll the majority of the WTO's members who are developing nations, and the summit ends in deadlock. The problem is that the U.S., the European Union, Japan, and a handful of other rich nations want the WTO to be "the constitution for a single global economy," a description that the first WTO Director General famously uttered in a moment of unguarded candor.

They want the WTO to enforce one-size-fits-all rules on an array of issues ranging far beyond trade which all WTO countries must adopt as their domestic practices. These broad WTO rules would implement worldwide what has become known as the "Washington Consensus."

While this agenda has proven to be a devastating failure; its agenda of eliminating a role for Government and public interest regulation of the market, establishing new property rights and protections for corporate interests, of creating tradable units out of vital public services, privatizing water, supplies, all of that, genetic materials and common resources, is at the heart of the WTO, which currently enforces 18 expansive agreements implementing this version of corporate-led globalization. Yet to the world's largest corporations and their client governments, this is only the beginning.

The U.S., the European Union, Japan, and others are pushing for decisions in Cancun to add to the WTO extreme terms that are now only contained in the clearly failed North American Free Trade Agreement. These new issues include expansive new investor rights, rules on government procurement eliminating local or environmental preferences, undercutting domestic environmental food safety laws, and new rights for foreign service corporations to turn Government services such as water treatment facilities, how we get our water, into for-profit foreign or domestic corporations.

Meanwhile, an increasingly consolidated block of developing nations have a different view. These nations want the WTO to deal simply with trade,

World Trade Organization, and do so in a way that benefits all of the WTO nations, not just the most powerful and the richest countries.

While different developing nations have different ideas about fair trade, they are united in opposing any expansion of the WTO into these new areas outside of just trade. When the Uruguay Round in 1994 created the WTO, developing countries were promised major gains. They were promised that industrialized nations would lower and eventually eliminate tariffs on items like textiles and apparel and cut agriculture subsidies that have enabled huge agribusinesses to dominate the world market. They were promised the WTO would be good for development in the poor countries. Newspapers and opinion shapers largely endorsed the ideas and promoted it.

As the WTO, however, moves forward on new issues of negotiations, these promises remain utterly unfulfilled. If the WTO is to maintain trade credibility as a trade organization rather than evolving into the CHO, the Corporate Handout Organization, it must revisit the issues that affect developing nations before adding to its agenda and it must stop pandering to the largest, most powerful multinational corporations in the world.

ULTRASOUND SURVEY RESULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to talk about my bill H.R. 195, which is the Informed Choice Act. The results of a recent survey commissioned by Care Net of 802 female registered voters nationwide unequivocally demonstrate that women coast to coast, and from all walks of life, agree that providing ultrasound technology for women's health centers is an important and worthwhile cause. It is clear that these women view ultrasound as an essential resource for women who are faced with unplanned pregnancies and the related decision to either terminate or to continue that pregnancy.

Nearly nine in 10, 87 percent of women, said it is important for non-profit women's health centers to provide ultrasound services, including a considerable majority, 64 percent, who believe this is a very important priority.

A majority of female registered voters believe that women facing crisis pregnancies would benefit from having access to ultrasound. Over half, 51 percent of those surveyed, said that women who are considering abortions should have access to ultrasound consistent with the rest of the prior to finalizing their decisions. In contrast, just 31 percent claim that seeing an image of what is inside would make such a decision more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly the belief of these women that ultrasound provides understanding, not uncertainty. It is with this new information in mind that I remind my colleagues about my bill, H.R. 195, "The Informed Choice Act." I have introduced this legislation authorizing HHS to establish grants for which nonprofit health clinics could apply and, if awarded, purchase the needed ultrasound equipment. Many uninsured women are prohibited from finding the health care they need because the free health clinics to which they have access are unable to provide medical services because of the lack of funds to purchase such medical equipment. The mother is, therefore, forced to wander from one clinic to another in search of the services that she so desperately needs. Enabling these health clinics to purchase ultrasound equipment would be a persuasive push in the direction of transitioning from a health clinic to a medical facility.

The advantages of ultrasound are many. It is fast and relatively cheap, costing about \$50 per exam. Ultrasound exams are performed at about 10 to 14 weeks of the pregnancy and are considered the best way to gauge growth before birth. Ultrasound can diagnose heart problems in the unborn child, find neural tube defects including spina bifida, and determine the position of the placenta. There is even now an ultrasound piece of equipment that can provide a 3-D image that can rotate 360 degrees to see all sides of the baby.

My legislation will ensure that doctors can provide critical information to mothers in the decision-making process regarding their pregnancies. Nothing in my bill makes ideology regarding abortion a condition for the grant. Whether a center offers abortion or abortion alternatives, the clinic is eligible so long as it meets the criteria set forth in the bill.

In the controversy today over abortion in America, emotionally charged rhetoric clouds the issue and does damage, I think, to the efforts made on behalf of mother and child. No matter one's conviction concerning abortion, we can all agree that the mother deserves as much information as is available in making this solemn decision. Information is the best weapon in diffusing the volatile discussion and returning us to our first concern, which is the health of the mother and child. The ultrasound equipment is a valuable tool in expanding the debate beyond traditional platitudes on both sides of the argument.

Modern medicine has provided us with a window into the womb. These advances in technology empower women with as much information as possible regarding their pregnancy. The goal of my legislation is to provide women who find themselves with an unplanned pregnancy with the full scope of information such that they may finally make an informed choice.

This bill is about the dissemination of information. The bill is about extending more free services to women