

Schiff	Stearns	Velázquez
Schrock	Stenholm	Visclosky
Scott (GA)	Strickland	Vitter
Scott (VA)	Stupak	Walden (OR)
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Walsh
Serrano	Sweeney	Wamp
Sessions	Tancredo	Waters
Shadegg	Tanner	Watson
Shaw	Tauscher	Watt
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Weiner
Sherwood	Terry	Weldon (FL)
Shimkus	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Shuster	Thompson (CA)	Weller
Simmons	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Simpson	Thornberry	Whitfield
Skelton	Tiahrt	Wilson (NM)
Slaughter	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Smith (MI)	Tierney	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Toomey	Woolsey
Smith (TX)	Towns	Wu
Smith (WA)	Turner (OH)	Wynn
Snyder	Turner (TX)	Young (AK)
Solis	Udall (NM)	Young (FL)
Spratt	Upton	
Stark	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—22

Bell	Istook	Pelosi
Berkley	John	Rodriguez
Camp	King (NY)	Souder
Cardoza	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
Davis (IL)	Marshall	Udall (CO)
DeFazio	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Fossella	Norwood	
Gibbons	Nunes	

□ 1324

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, due to personal business, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall votes 55 and 56 on March 11, 2004. Had I been present for rollcall 55 on H.R. 3717, the "Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2004," I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for rollcall 56, H. Con. Res. 15, "Commending India on its celebration of Republic Day," I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a personal explanation of the reason for my absence on March 10 and 11, 2004. Last week, former Governor of Nevada Mike O'Callaghan passed away and I had to leave Washington this Wednesday afternoon, March 10, to attend funeral services for Governor O'Callaghan.

I respectfully request that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that if present, I would have voted:

Rollcall vote No. 48, on agreeing to the Scott (VA) amendment—"no";

Rollcall vote No. 49, on agreeing to the Watt amendment—"no";

Rollcall vote No. 50, on agreeing to the Andrews amendment—"no";

Rollcall vote No. 51, on agreeing to the Ackerman amendment—"no";

Rollcall vote No. 52, on agreeing to the Jackson-Lee amendment—"no";

Rollcall vote No. 53, on agreeing to the Watt amendment—"no";

Rollcall vote No. 54, on agreeing to the Resolution, H.R. 339—"yes";

Rollcall vote No. 55, on passage of H.R. 3717—"yes";

Rollcall vote No. 56, on passage of H. Con. Res. 15—"yes"; and

Rollcall vote No. 57, on passage of H. Res. 540—"yes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House for the purposes of inquiring of the acting majority leader the schedule for the coming week; and I would be glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), who chairs the leadership committee, or I am not sure of his exact title, but he is my friend and an able Member of this body, and I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding to me, and I would be happy to talk about the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning business, 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those will also be sent to Members' offices by the end of this week. Any votes called on those suspensions will be rolled until 6:30 p.m., as has been our custom.

On Wednesday and Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the House will convene at 10 a.m. We still hope to consider the budget resolution for fiscal year 2005, although that is being worked out.

In addition, as we all know, next week is the anniversary of the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom, as well as the anniversary of Saddam Hussein's chemical weapons attacks against the Kurds. So on Wednesday, the House will consider a resolution remembering these historical events and commemorating the allied forces, including our troops, for the liberation of Iraq.

Finally, I would like to remind all Members that we do not plan to have votes next Friday, March 19.

I thank my friend from Maryland very much for yielding to me, and I would be happy to answer any questions, or try to answer any questions, he might have.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information he has provided us.

This is the first time at least that I have heard of the consideration of the Iraqi resolution next week. I understand the timing of that and the date on which that effort began. Because I have just heard about this and have not had an opportunity to talk to our ranking members on either the foreign affairs committee or on the defense committee, can the gentleman inform me as to whether or not this resolution has been put together in a bipartisan way, with participation by the minority? The reason I ask the gentleman that is I think all of us want to ensure that we are united on it.

I have not seen the statement so I do not know what it is, but clearly we are, I think, all proud of the actions of our Armed Forces; and they carried out their mission in an extraordinarily effective, efficient, and courageous manner. We are all proud of our men and women in uniform for what they have done. We are all pleased, as well, that Saddam Hussein has been captured and is in custody and no longer at least poses a personal threat; but I am sure my friend from Ohio agrees that hopefully this statement will be one which is reached in a bipartisan way and we can have overwhelmingly bipartisan support of.

I certainly, as one who supported, as my colleague knows, the effort in Iraq and supported the funding for that effort, want to be able to support it. I have not seen it, but I am hopeful that we do this in a bipartisan way.

I would be glad to yield to my friend to comment on this issue.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I have not seen the resolution either. It has not been introduced yet. My understanding is that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) has taken the lead on that and the Committee on International Relations, and he will be consulting with the gentleman from California (Ranking Member LANTOS), and I am sure he would appreciate any input that Members have on both sides. It would be good if we could as a House support this resolution on a bipartisan basis because it will be, as my colleague said, important to be able to show that support for our troops who are currently in Iraq performing for us and for the American people.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information; and I understand he is a little bit in the same position I am, having just learned of this in the last few minutes. I am pleased to hear that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) will be communicating with and working with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). Again, while there are, obviously, as we all know, disagreements on the prosecution of that effort, whether we should have undertaken it, there is no, I think, dispute on the underlying support of our troops, their effort, their safety, and their objectives. Hopefully, that is what we will articulate.

I thank the gentleman for his information, and I will surely be talking to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), as I know our leader will, to try to make sure that we are all together on this statement, which I think will be good for our troops and good for the world to see as well. I thank the gentleman.

We had expected to see the budget resolution on the floor next week. Then, frankly, we had heard in the last few hours, or few minutes, that that was not going to be the case, that the markup had been called off or cancelled, rescheduled by the gentleman

from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for next week. Our presumption was, if that was the case, then the budget would be delayed a week.

Now the information is, and I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the leader, is not on the floor, it is my understanding that perhaps he is working on trying to effect agreement, but can the gentleman tell me whether or not he has confidence that that will be on the floor next week, or are we waiting to see what is going to happen today to make that final decision?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will yield further, it is still up in the air. As the gentleman knows, we had planned to have the budget marked up in committee today and then brought to the floor next week. It is important that we keep our time frame because it is important that we have our appropriations bills done in a timely manner. So we are still hopeful that can happen, but we have had some delays in the markup today. We did get started on the markup. We had some good opening statements, and we are going back into committee later today, but there are currently negotiations over whether we can finish that today or not.

I will say that we are excited about the budget document. It does restrain spending, which we believe is the right thing to do. There have been some disagreements between the bodies, even between Members, on both sides of the aisle, over some of the budget enforcement mechanisms. Those are more the issues here that have to do with caps and PAYGOs and those sorts of issues; but the budget itself, this resolution, we hope to be able to mark up today. If not, we will certainly mark it up next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Last week, I asked the leader and would ask the gentleman, as we approach next week, assuming that the budget is to be on the floor next week, about the commitment of the majority to allowing the minority, as has historically happened, to have various alternatives. As the gentleman knows, the Congressional Black Caucus has always had the opportunity to offer an alternative that was a thoughtful, persuasive budget. I did not always support it.

□ 1330

We have other caucuses who may want to offer alternatives as well, and clearly the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget on our side of the aisle, will want to offer a substitute as well.

Is the gentleman aware of whether or not, as has happened in the past, we will be afforded the opportunity to offer various alternatives to the budget document that will be reported out of committee?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

It is my understanding that, as in prior years, the Committee on Rules will give preference to complete substitutes rather than amendments to the budget document. It is my understanding further that we will provide adequate time, as we have in the past, for both general debate and for these substitutes.

Historically, this debate has varied between 3 to 5 hours for general debate and 40 minutes to 1 hour for amendments or substitutes. It is my understanding that it is the intention once again for the Committee on Rules to provide those kinds of rules. Of course, they have not seen the various resolutions yet, including the one that comes out of the Committee on the Budget. But that is certainly the intent of the Committee on Rules at this point.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that observation, and I would hope we do follow that practice. Because, clearly, while the budget document, in particular for those of us who serve on the Committee on Appropriations, is a relatively broad-brush document, it does very pointedly speak to the priorities that Members have and that we think our country ought to have. Because of that, it becomes even more important, I think, in the people's House that the people's representatives have an opportunity to offer alternatives so that not only Members, but the American public can form a judgment of their own as to what alternative is in the best interest of our country.

So I appreciate the gentleman's observation that full substitutes, and usually, as you know, that is what we have been offering, and certainly it is the intention of the gentleman from South Carolina, as the ranking member, to offer a substitute. Of course we do not know what ultimately is going to happen, we will have to see what the Committee on the Budget produces, but I am sure that the gentleman from South Carolina will want to offer a substitute.

The gentleman mentioned enforcement mechanisms. The Senate, as you know, the other body, has adopted an enforcement mechanism, which we think if you are going to have an enforcement mechanism makes sense.

First of all, does the gentleman know whether the enforcement mechanism will be in a separate piece or legislation included in the budget offering itself?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. PORTMAN. Let me say at the outset that we welcome a substitute from the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), better yet that he supports the substitute the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) will offer in committee. But certainly having an alternative is welcome and the debate will be a healthy one.

With regard to any budget enforcement mechanisms, there has not been a

decision whether that will be part of the budget resolution. I think that is part of the discussion now whether there will be separate legislation. There are advantages and disadvantage to both, I suppose, but that decision has not been made yet.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's response. In addition, of course, to the substitute, or an amendment to the budget in the form of a substitute, I am sure that we would be, depending upon what comes out of the committee, very much committed to offering an enforcement mechanism proposal of our own. We believe that the enforcement mechanism that was in place some years ago was effective in reaching balance and, in fact, taking us into surplus. That was allowed to lapse, and is not in force now, which allowed us to do the tax cuts that were passed over the last 3 years.

Is the gentleman of the view that we will be allowed to have, under the rules, a substitute and/or amendments to the proposal for enforcement that is reported out of the Committee on the Budget?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I do not know what form it will take. If it is part of the budget resolution, I suppose then other budget resolution substitutes, as we talked about earlier, might include enforcement mechanisms as well. The gentleman mentioned the ranking member may indeed offer one of his own. If it is separate legislation, the Committee on Rules would take that up.

I do not know, I would say to my friend from Maryland, I do not know when that would be. I do not know if it will be the same time as the budget. There are other committees, particularly the Committee on Rules, that will have jurisdiction of any enforcement mechanism. Ultimately, it is up to the will of the Congress, is it not, as to how we enforce our budgets?

I just do not know what the likely form will take. Again, I think our goal would be to have a healthy debate over the enforcement mechanisms. We feel strongly that spending ought to be subject to the pay-go rules. We feel strongly that the tax relief that was enacted over the last 3 years has now turned this economy around and we are beginning to see growth. So we would hate to subject those to the kinds of pay-go rules that would not have permitted, during the time when the economy was in bad shape, for us to begin to get some economic stimulus and growth.

So this may be some of the debates we will have on the floor, and I would think we would encourage that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's comment, but as he knows, Mr. Greenspan, who has not been necessarily an advocate of our side of the argument, as a matter of fact, has been on the gentleman's side of the argument on the tax cuts, has

made it very clear that he believes, for the interest of economic security and stability in the country, that the pay-go rules ought to apply on both the spending and the tax side. Because, of course, in either event, you can plunge yourself, as we believe we have, into deep deficits.

So I think that will be a good debate. We will obviously point to Mr. Greenspan's assertions, which we agree in this instance, that it is very difficult to control if you do not have pay-go applying on both sides of the ledger.

Lastly, if I might, as a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman knows that the Foreign Sales Corporation legislation has been pending for many, many months now. We are concerned, as you know, that the Europeans are now imposing sanctions as a result of the WTO's finding that we are not in compliance.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the FSC legislation will be on the floor any time soon; and, if so, whether or not the Rangel-Manzullo alternative will be made in order as an alternative?

I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding to me again.

The legislation is very much on our minds. As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has worked hard on this legislation already. The gentleman mentioned the substitute which the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) may want to offer in committee. The tariff increases are beginning to take effect, increasing by 1 percent every month, so it is something we are working hard on.

We do want to work closely with the other body on this to be sure that we can actually enact legislation, as well as with the President and with his team, the U.S. Trade Representative's Office and the Treasury Department in particular. So we are working closely with them.

I do not know when legislation may come to the floor, but I understand that the Committee on Ways and Means is planning another meeting next week to discuss certain aspects of this, to be sure that as we repeal the FSC/ETI provisions, we are also providing adequate benefits for U.S. companies who are involved in global competition.

So this is a very high priority on our side of the aisle and we continue to work toward that goal.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and while I accept his premise that it is a high priority, very frankly, I will tell my friend from Ohio, there is no doubt we could have passed a bipartisan supported bill here with a very substantial number of votes many, many months ago. That was not the determination, apparently, of the committee to report out such a bill. We think that is unfortunate.

We believe that if the Rangel-Crane or the Rangel-Manzullo bill, or the Manzullo-Rangel bill were reported out, I think we would see well over 225 to 230 votes for that, maybe more. But in any event, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield a moment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PORTMAN. I respect the gentleman's vote-counting ability, as he knows, but being on the committee, I can say that I am not certain such a bill could have even been reported out the committee because there are many complexities with responding to this tough issue.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, if I can just briefly, I share the gentleman's view. I do not think such a bill could be reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means either. Our perception is, as the gentleman well knows, it is tough to pass bipartisan bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means because I do not think there is any interest in doing that. I think that is unfortunate because this is a critical problem confronting us.

I think we could have, as we have in the past, and the drug reimportation being a perfect example of a bill that passed very handily in a bipartisan fashion through this House. Unfortunately, it did not make it out of the conference committee. Notwithstanding the fact that both Houses were for it, there were people who were not for it.

But this is a critical problem, and my only suggestion to my good friend, with whom I have worked in a very bipartisan fashion on very successful legislation, and I know the gentleman's inclination is to do that, to legislate, not just to throw bombs at one another. I thank the gentleman for his observation and hope, in fact, that he is correct and we move on this quickly. And if it is not a bipartisan bill as it comes to the floor, I hope that we do provide for the minority an opportunity to offer an alternative which we think will be in the best interest of this country. We will debate that and the majority will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and thank him for the information.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will recognize Members for special order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

LOSS OF JOBS IN OHIO

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, yesterday President Bush made a campaign trip to Cleveland to speak to small business people to explain his economic policy and to try to answer why Ohio has lost 300,000 jobs in the last 3 years; to try to explain why Ohio has lost 160,000 manufacturing jobs; that one out of every six manufacturing jobs in Ohio has disappeared, likely permanently for most of them. One out of six jobs in manufacturing has disappeared since President Bush took office.

He also came to Ohio to answer why the head of his council, the chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers, Gregory Mankiw, said that outsourcing of jobs, jobs moving overseas, that Mr. Mankiw said and the President signed a report supporting this, that outsourcing was a good thing because it makes the economy more efficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the President needs to explain a little better. Last week, I was in Akron, in my district. Akron, Ohio. I spoke to some company owners who own small machine shops with 50 employees, 30 employees, or 100 employees, but all small manufacturing businesses. One owner of a machine shop came up to me before I spoke. He gave me a stack of these fliers. He actually gave me about four times this many, about six or seven inches of fliers. He told me that he gets about this many fliers every month, and he says these fliers are auction fliers. They basically are notifications from companies all over the United States that are having fire sales; that are having going-out-of-business sales.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, here is an auction flyer that says high-tech manufacturing plant closing in Elk Grove, Indiana.