

Slaughter	Taylor (NC)	Vitter
Smith (MI)	Terry	Walden (OR)
Smith (NJ)	Thomas	Walsh
Smith (TX)	Thompson (CA)	Wamp
Snyder	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Solis	Thornberry	Weiner
Souder	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Spratt	Tiberi	Weldon (PA)
Stearns	Tierney	Weller
Stenholm	Toomey	Wexler
Strickland	Towns	Whitfield
Stupak	Turner (OH)	Wicker
Sullivan	Turner (TX)	Wilson (NM)
Sweeney	Udall (CO)	Wilson (SC)
Tancred	Udall (NM)	Wolf
Tanner	Upton	Woolsey
Tauscher	Van Hollen	Wu
Tauzin	Velázquez	Young (AK)
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	Young (FL)

## ANSWERED PRESENT—5

Brown, Corrine	Lee	Watt
Johnson, E. B.	Waters	

## NOT VOTING—33

Bereuter	Eshoo	Millender-
Brown-Waite,	Farr	McDonald
Ginny	Fattah	Myrick
Clay	Gephardt	Ortiz
Clyburn	Grijalva	Pombo
Conyers	Gutierrez	Rahall
Cox	Honda	Ryun (KS)
Culberson	Inslee	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Kucinich	Stark
Dicks	Langevin	Watson
Dooley (CA)	Lucas (OK)	Wynn
English	McCrery	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1911

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to be present for recorded votes today due to health reasons. However, if I had been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on rollcall vote Nos. 12, 13 and 14.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2013

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER) at 8 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.

## 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 DUTY OF LEADERS TO BE RESPONSIBLE IN THEIR RHETORIC

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the most fundamental right that is guaranteed to us by the founders of our country is the right to speak freely. The Founding Fathers knew that public discourse is the backbone of a republic and must be inherent to a free society. As leaders, it is our job to raise the level of public debate in this country so that we can leave behind a legacy of sound decision enhanced by free-willed people. But we should never lower the bar of public debate to the point where baseless rhetoric is the standard.

It is our duty, Mr. Speaker, as leaders, to raise the level of public debate to a level where truth can be self-evident, where the lines of fact and fiction are clear and not blurred, and where it would be unimaginable for a public figure to blatantly deceive the American people.

We have a duty to all Americans, as leaders, to be responsible in our rhetoric, honest in our discourse, and truthful in our debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have been profoundly disappointed in some of the recent public discourse by some regarding President Bush's service to our country. On Sunday morning, Terry McAuliffe, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said that President Bush was AWOL from the Alabama National Guard. Furthermore, he said that President Bush, as a member of the National Guard, never served our country in the military. In my hands right here I hold President George Bush's DD-214, which is the official separation record of any service member. Let the record show that it says right here that President Bush, our Commander in Chief, served honorably in the National Guard and received an honorable discharge.

For those of the Vietnam era, like I was, who will remember the service of National Guard troops, they understand that a fighter pilot unit was not the best place to hide in the National Guard. My own personal recollection is that one morning as a copilot on a C-130, I had been held overnight at that base that was abandoned and was being reopened at Takhli Air Force Base in Thailand. When I got up and walked outside the tent that morning there was an F-105 pilot there. He was nervous and said, "Where am I? Twelve hours ago," he said, "I was teaching school in Kansas." He was in the Kansas National Guard. Twelve hours later, after teaching school, he is in the Southeast Asian conflict, flying wild weasel missions over the north.

Mr. Speaker, the National Guard flying fighters was not a place to hide during the Vietnam conflict. It is next to impossible for the President to have received an honorable discharge if he was found guilty or even accused of

AWOL. McAuliffe's charges are to imply that the Guard would have given an honorable discharge to someone who did not show up for service.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this accusation is reckless, it is irresponsible, and it is false. These charges are slanderous and without merit. It is outrageous for a leader of a political party and a top surrogate of the Presidential forerunner to be making this charge in our public discourse.

Especially upsetting to me is that McAuliffe believes that serving in the National Guard does not constitute serving in the military. To imply that the National Guard is not military service is to dismiss the sacrifices of tens of thousands of National Guardsmen and women who have served before and are presently serving. And it is a slap in the face to their service and their families.

National Guardsmen in World War II landed at Omaha Beach. The New Mexico National Guard served in the Pacific, and still today we honor those members who survived the Bataan Death March, who were members of the National Guard in New Mexico.

Currently there are more than 193,000 National Guard members and Reservists currently serving our country in the war on terror. About 40 percent of the soldiers in Iraq are Guard and Reserve. In my district alone I have more than 1,500 National Guardsmen and women and Reservists currently serving on Active Duty.

And, Mr. Speaker, it would be a cold day in July in New Mexico before I would let anyone say that these men and women, the people that I represent in this fine institution, do not serve our country.

I went to Iraq, Mr. Speaker, and I met personally with young men and women who are serving there. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard and Reserves are steadfast servants to our country, serving to ensure that liberty for others is achieved. Some of these men and women are on the front lines. They serve as a wedge between terrorism and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the National Guard and Reserve soldiers are serving our country as we speak. As a member of the Air Force, I find Mr. McAuliffe's characterizations insulting and demeaning. Terry McAuliffe cheapens the National Guard by saying it is not military service. His baseless insinuations diminish the National Guard as an institution. He owes an apology to the men and women in the National Guard and Reserve uniforms who are serving our country and protecting their fellow Americans.

Mr. McAuliffe's comments represent the worst of election year politics. It must be a sad day to be a member of the political party whose leader publicly denounces, degrades, and dishonors the fighting force that is at this moment fighting for freedom and liberty and who have risked their lives to fight terrorism around the world.

It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, when we allow our public debate to be laced with deception in this body and the other body. We have a duty to the American people and to future generations to raise the level of our honest public debate in this country. Let that be our legacy.

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

#### POTENTIAL CLIMATE CHANGE DUE TO EARTH WARMING

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend just a couple of minutes discussing facts about the potential for climate change. Is there such a thing as climate change? Is the earth warming?

On the perspective of climate change and whether or not there is global warming, tonight I would like to discuss the oceans, which make up about 70 percent of the earth's surface. The ocean has a huge moderating effect on the heat balance of the planet. As the oceans affect our climate, they move in currents around the globe and bring either cold water or warm water to different areas. And that effect has this immense balancing of the heat on the planet. And we have experienced fairly moderate temperatures for hundreds of years.

We all know that the climate does change periodically. We have had Ice Ages in the past. In the past there have been plants growing in the area we now call the Antarctic. So climate does change over a period of time. There is some indication, though, that when the climate has changed in the past, it has changed quickly, sometimes dramatically, without human intervention.

What I would like to speak to tonight is human activity causing the ocean surface temperature to rise. A number of scientists who have written a number of articles recently have shown clear evidence that in the last 40 years, ocean temperatures around the globe on their surface have increased rather dramatically.

As a matter of fact, the increase in the last 40 years can be compared to the increase in the last 1,000 years. Now, there are certain things that cause the ocean to move. We know wind causes it to move, the temperature of the water will cause it to move, the salinity of the ocean will cause certain movements, the rotation of the earth, evaporation and precipitation. These are all effects that cause the ocean to move. But since the ocean temperature is warming, there is more

evaporation around the equatorial regions because the ocean is warming more there than has been in recent times. As a result of that, there is more precipitation in the northern part of our oceans.

Ocean currents, then, which are affected by these conditions, whether it is wind, temperature, salinity and so on, the ocean currents are having a tendency to move differently. Ocean currents have a dynamic impact on the climate balance of the planet because it moves warm water, thus the weather, or a change of weather, to different parts of the planet.

For example, England is on the same latitude as Labrador, but England has a much warmer climate than Labrador. Part of this is because of ocean currents moving in the Atlantic Ocean.

If we can take the Atlantic Ocean as an example, if you look at the Atlantic Ocean, the currents move in a clockwise fashion. We know that the gulf stream moving north along the coast of the United States moves north. When it gets up to the area of Greenland-Iceland-Norway, it then moves south. This current has been going for hundreds, if not thousands, of years.

The reason the current is so strong in this area is because when the water moves further north, it gets colder and more dense and begins to sink. As a result of a relationship of evaporation and precipitation, when it moves further north it gets saltier. When the water is cold and saltier it sinks fast, creating a pump that pushes the water south. Hence, we have a conveyor belt that keeps the north Atlantic moving in a clockwise motion.

What is beginning to happen now, though, is interesting. Glaciers are melting, the polar ice cap is diminishing. There is greater rainfall in the north Atlantic. And as a result of these conditions, caused in part by the warming on the ocean surface, we have fresh water being a major part of the north Atlantic.

Even though fresh water will sink because it is more dense, it sinks very slowly. The fact that you have saltwater with the cold fresh water, it sinks faster. Because the water is becoming fresher, less saltier in the north Atlantic, the pump is slowing down, which means the conveyor belt is slowing down, which means the warmer water that is moving to the northern areas from the equatorial regions of the planet is not moving as fast.

So the consequence of this, the potential consequence of this, is a much colder area in the north Atlantic, which would mean the United States and that area, Asia, Europe, and Scandinavia.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of interesting facts about the potential climate change.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order out of order.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S 2005 BUDGET

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in great disagreement with the funding priorities set forth by our President that was just unveiled a few days ago in his 2005 budget. Over and over again we hear that President Bush wants to create jobs, protect our environment, and help the uninsured and make our Nation a safer place for future generations.

However, the President has raised or released a budget with the record deficit of \$521 billion that is, in my opinion, one of the most anti-worker, anti-health care, and anti-environmental proposals in modern times.

When the President took office it was the first time in 70 years that a President had a surplus, a surplus of \$5.6 trillion. For the third year in a row, this administration has proposed more oversize tax cuts that just drive the budget further into the red and do nothing to bolster the priorities of the American public.

We need more jobs. We need better access to health care. We need more funding for education and more environmental protections. And most of all, we need a commitment by this administration to make these priorities.

Let us look at the reality facing our American families. Since President Bush took office, the economy is down 2.9 million private sector jobs; 2.9 million jobs lost. And I am referring to a chart here, unemployment rates in my own district. When I look at the cities that I represent, for example, the city of El Monte, we are still upwards of 7.9 percent in unemployment. In the area of east Los Angeles, where a large number of Hispanics live, we are almost up to 10 percent. It has been there stagnating for almost 3 years.

□ 2030

It has not changed the course that the President would like us all to believe that somehow the economy is recovering; 90,000 workers a week are running out of unemployment benefits with no jobs in sight because the Bush economy is creating only one job for every three people that are unemployed. Yet we continually hear promises that the tax cuts will create jobs. Workers need more economic security, not tax cuts. And workers in small businesses, particularly in districts like mine who thrive and are the ones that are actually making a better life for us in our country, are having to face a 10 percent budget cut in the Small Business Administration. And since the year 2001, 2.4 million more Americans have lost their health care.