

United States would come down at least 30 percent.

Now, I am not good in mathematics, but 30 percent of \$220 billion is over \$60 billion a year. That would be the largest tax cut we could ever give the American people. If the goal of the tax cut is to allow Americans to keep and spend more of their own money, then market access certainly should be part of that equation.

We also had Dr. Elizabeth Wenner, who has her own program going in the State of Vermont to encourage the patients there in her clinics to buy their drugs and make it easier for them to legally and safely buy those drugs from pharmacists across the border in Canada. She has numbers to demonstrate how much their patients have saved; and the average, believe it or not, is over 60 percent.

Then we had Mayor Albano, the mayor of Springfield, Massachusetts. He began his voluntary plan for city employees there and he has only been operating for a few months, and his estimates are that they have saved \$600,000. We are talking about real money, I say to my colleagues. It is not just about seniors; it is about everybody.

Victor Hugo said, more powerful than an invading army is an idea whose time has come. I do not know what is going to happen in the conference committee, but I know this: you cannot hold back an idea whose time has come.

PASS THE ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the House majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), said this, and I quote: "Nothing is more important in the face of war than cutting taxes."

As someone who represents Fort Hood in Texas where 17,000 soldiers have left, now fighting in Iraq, I find the gentleman's priorities to be somewhat bizarre. I think he is wrong, and I think the American people would agree that he is wrong. In a time of war, nothing is more important than supporting our troops and our military families.

I find it shameful that the same majority leader who said, "Nothing is more important than cutting taxes during a time of war," has actually, along with the Speaker of the House, kept bottled up right here in the well of the House for 7 months the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act, an act that would provide some meager tax benefits for brave servicemen and -women and their families, including our military personnel now in Iraq, in Afghanistan. The same House Republican leadership who earlier this year fought so hard to pass a \$230,000 tax break to

American citizens making \$1 million this year in dividend income cannot seem to say we can afford to pass a modest tax benefit bill for military servicemen and -women even though our Nation is at war.

I find it amazing that that same House leadership today thought that we had enough time in the Congress to rename three post offices this afternoon; but they have not had time in 7 months, in 7 months, to grab the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act and bring it to the floor of the House, which they could do tomorrow and we could pass by unanimous consent.

I think it sends a terrible message to our military families and to those in combat, in harm's way, that we can pass a \$230,000 tax break for people making \$1 million in dividend income this year sitting safely in their homes and offices in America, but we cannot afford or we cannot find time to help out a little bit with real estate tax benefits, with gratuity tax benefits, which we will partly deal with tomorrow with the Renzi-McGovern bill, but also with benefits to help Guardsmen and Reservists pay for the cost of their travel and overnight stay and meals when they are doing training for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House Republican leadership should explain to the American people why they would hold up the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act simply because the Senate added an amendment, and then passed the bill unanimously, to pay for that military benefit by shutting the loophole on Benedict Arnolds who turn their backs on our country, renounce their citizenship, just to simply avoid paying American taxes. It seems to me that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) should explain why, at least in their actions, they are saying, in effect, that protecting Benedict Arnolds is more important than providing tax benefits for our brave servicemen and -women.

Now, I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) originally introduced this bill back in September, but I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) for his leadership tomorrow on the bill to provide increased death benefit gratuities, as someone who just received two death notices from Fort Hood soldiers in my district today. That is the right thing to do, although, frankly, I am not sure we should be too proud of the fact that we are increasing the military death combat benefit to surviving family members to \$12,000. Families whose loved ones lost their lives in the September 11 tragedy received on average over \$1 million from various sources, and yet we are increasing the death gratuity to \$12,000.

Now, even that death gratuity benefit, as important as it is, and I will

vote for it and we will probably pass it unanimously tomorrow; but let us keep it in perspective. If we assume approximately 300 deaths so far in the Iraqi war and in Afghanistan and in that whole combat arena, that is going to cost the American taxpayers about \$1.8 million, million. Yet the House Committee on Ways and Means today found time and the affordability to pass a \$40 billion tax cut to multinational corporations and, overall, a \$60 billion tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act. Our servicemen and women deserve no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Florida.

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

There was no objection.

DEATH GRATUITY TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I really appreciate what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) from the Democratic side and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) from the Republican side are doing. I want to explain as to some of the speeches I have heard tonight. This is an effort; I go back myself. I hate to talk about myself, but for 2 years I have been trying to get this death gratuity tax removed. In fairness to the leadership, both Democrat and Republican, we have passed to the Senate, five times over 2 years, a bill, a larger bill than this bill, that would have removed the death gratuity and also some of the other issues that would have been fair to our military as it relates to tax fairness that the gentleman from Texas, my friend, mentioned. I do not know about the recent bill, but the bills that we passed in the

last five times in the last 2 years would have accomplished some of these considerations for our men and women in uniform.

I just want to mention very quickly that this year, and I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my bill dealt with removing the death gratuity 2 years ago; but it was \$6,000. That was the cap on the death gratuity amount. I am glad that the McGovern bill and the Renzi bill both move it up to \$12,000. It is what it should be. But for me, when I started this effort 2 years ago, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), it dealt with eliminating the death gratuity tax.

So again I want to say that I am pleased tonight that we are all, both Republican and Democrat, believing that the military tax fairness bill that has been sent over a few months ago has not been taken up by the Senate side, and I do not know the status on this side of a second bill.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman. He has been courageous in standing up for military families and veterans, one of only two Republicans to sign the discharge petition on concurrent receipt.

The gentleman was mistaken in that the Senate has taken no action on the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act. They passed that unanimously 97 to 0 in March, 7 months ago. It has been sitting here at the Speaker's desk, and if the House Republican leadership would bring it to the floor tomorrow, we could pass it unanimously. Apparently, what they object to in passing the bill is closing the Benedict Arnold tax loophole.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for correcting me. I was mistaken about the Senate's action and I stand corrected. I will say, and then I will yield back the balance of my time, because I think even though we all have our reasons for feeling that some action has not been taken and possibly, I will say this, that I believe that we all, in a bipartisan way, support our men and women in uniform, we support their families, and we want to make sure that those who have given their lives for this country that the families are adequately compensated; not that there is enough, quite frankly, to pay those who have given their lives for this country.

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

(Mr. HINCHEY 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 claim the time of the gentleman from New York.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY CONCERNS

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, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the good work they have done. I have come to the House floor night after night since July sharing concerns about the treatment of our men and women in uniform in Iraq, concerns about the basis of our Iraq policy, concerns about the \$87 billion we are spending in Iraq, in addition to the \$1 billion a week we have already been spending; about the corruption and the ineptness of the Bush administration and their all-too-often focusing more on the private contractors like Halliburton and Bechtel than they have on the safety of our armed services and our troops.

□ 2100

And as a result, Mr. Speaker, I have shared these from my constituents night after night since July about these issues. I would like to do that again this evening.

Paula from Akron, Ohio, writes, "We need to be concerned with our troubled economy at home. This country doesn't have \$87 billion to send overseas when we have an education system that is in shambles and millions out of work."

Cory of Copley, Ohio, writes, "Please do not give the administration another blank check so they can continue their oil wars. Tell them to pull out of Iraq and let the U.N. take control. The administration has lied to the country. Please do your part in returning our country to the people."

I think Cory was talking about some of the statements from some of the top leaders in this country about weapons of mass destruction and other issues which have proven to be not true.

Karen of Broadview Heights writes, "We have been way too patient with men who clearly do not know what they are doing and who do not care how much of the taxpayers' money they spend to do it."

Michael of Strongsville writes, "I think it is either irresponsible or insane, or perhaps both, to have huge tax cuts at the same time we are spending huge amounts for war." What Michael is referring to is that this Congress and the President have passed a tax cut where the average millionaire gets a \$93,000 tax cut while half of the people in my State got literally zero dollars in

a tax cut. "I hope our legislative branch of government," Michael writes, "deliberates long and hard before coughing up another \$87 billion."

Colette of Strongsville writes, "To give them \$73 billion more to continue their real aim, contracts for Halliburton, Bechtel, and others in corporate America, would be a crime against the people in the United States who now reel with economic deterioration at home. It is time to hold those accountable who led us into such a dark place in our Nation's history." What Colette is talking about, Mr. Speaker, is that we spend a billion a week today, before the \$87 billion appropriation, a billion dollars a week in Iraq today.

The President has by and large privatized the military in the sense that one-third of that billion now goes to private contractors, Halliburton, Bechtel, other major companies, all of those companies are major contributors to the President, to his campaign. The President has raised almost \$100 million already. Much of it comes from these companies.

I would add too that Halliburton, the company where Vice President CHENEY, before Governor Bush tapped him as his running mate, Vice President CHENEY was CEO of this company. He still is receiving \$13,000 a month from Halliburton while Halliburton is getting, literally, hundreds of millions of dollars in unbid contracts.

So what we see, Mr. Speaker, and what Colette obviously is upset about, is we are privatizing, in many ways, much of the military, \$300 million a week going to these private companies in unbid contracts, and those companies are still paying, in one case, the Vice President of the United States \$13,000 a month.

Sandy of Hinckley, Ohio, writes, "It is of extreme importance for the future of this country to hold President Bush accountable. We lost a great deal in human life and money for claims that even President Bush cannot now and does not now defend."

Vera of Strongsville writes, "I want my tax dollars rebuilding us, not Iraq or any other country. \$87 billion would go a long way here in the United States. Secretary Rumsfeld and his team need to be replaced with some honest and caring people who will tell the truth and do the best things for the Iraqi people and will bring our troops home safely."

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago when the \$87 billion was approved by this body, I had an amendment that required that all U.S. companies which relocated their headquarters to an offshore tax haven would be ineligible for any government contracts. In other words, if a company moved offshore to avoid taxes, they could no longer get any government contracts to do work in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration opposed that amendment. The Republican leadership in this House