

our country, the cost of medicine will skyrocket and the availability is going to shrink?

Mr. BURGESS. I think access is going to be severely, severely restricted. A woman who is the head of the Columbia University residency program, an OB-GYN, Columbia University has a very good residency program, perhaps second only to Parkland Hospital where I did my residency, this individual told me that currently they were accepting people into their residency program that 5 years ago they would not have even interviewed. That is, the quality of applicant has dropped off so significantly because people simply fear this issue. They see no reason to enter a life where there is going to be this much uncertainty. So it is really extracting a high toll as far as the availability of our future providers, not just what is happening right now, but what is happening for our children and our children's children.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman. If we have the Edwards-Kerry trial lawyer ticket, we probably will not have any serious medical liability reform, would we?

Mr. BURGESS. That is my firm belief as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I think we had a good discussion here today. I notice my friends on the other side of the aisle are here chomping at the bit and I know are eagerly awaiting freedom of speech, equal time; and my friend from California is grabbing the mike right now for a discussion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). The Chair will remind all Members to refrain from improper references to individual Senators. While references to Members in their capacity as presumptive nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency are not prohibited, references to other Members of the Senate must be consistent with clause 1 of rule XVII.

WHO IS IN CONTROL?

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to say to my friend from Georgia, when he is talking about past Vice President Dan Quayle, what he needed to do was know how to spell potato.

Madam Speaker, last week President Bush was asked what distinguishes Vice President DICK CHENEY from Senator JOHN EDWARDS, JOHN KERRY's Vice Presidential running mate. Mr. Bush's haughty reply was, "DICK CHENEY can be President."

This implied criticism of Senator EDWARDS, who happens to sit on the prominent Senate Intelligence Committee. And this is quite laughable be-

cause Senator EDWARDS actually has more experience than George W. Bush did at the time he ran for office in the year 2000.

The appalling part of this comment is that not only could DICK CHENEY be President, he has performed the functions of the Presidency. Since day one, DICK CHENEY has wheeled, dealt and cajoled his way to accomplish his dangerous, self-serving, neo-conservative agenda.

DICK CHENEY has chomped at the bit to finish the job he started in 1991 as Secretary of Defense when the United States first went to war with Iraq. In the year 2003 when President Bush needed to make the case for going to war with Iraq, it was DICK CHENEY who met with the intelligence analysts at the CIA to determine whether Iraq possessed nuclear weapons.

Vice President CHENEY claims that he did not strong-arm these analysts into adopting his view that Iraq was in possession of weapons of mass destruction. Despite what I am sure were CHENEY's best and most benevolent intentions, the Vice President of the United States probably registered quite a bit of influence with a bunch of career CIA analysts who were likely to give him the evidence he wanted, whether it was true or not. And it was Vice President CHENEY, not President Bush, the Commander in Chief, who gave the unsuccessful order to shoot down the hijacked planes on September 11. At a time when America was being attacked, it was Vice President CHENEY who made the important decisions.

By now this pattern should be quite clear. Vice President CHENEY does the real work of the administration, making the key decisions in our times of greatest need.

□ 2145

When George Bush says that DICK CHENEY can be President, he is right, but that says more about President Bush's own failure of leadership than it says anything about Vice President CHENEY's abilities.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. They deserve better than a man-behind-the-man presidency. Senator JOHN EDWARDS will not be the kind of Vice President who will falsify intelligence for the purposes of sending our young men and women to war. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, he knows better.

We need leaders who will not abdicate the Constitution in the name of political opportunism, a Presidential team that will pursue smarter policies than those of the current administration.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, the SMART security resolution, which provides a much smarter national security platform than the one we currently have. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism. SMART security means confronting the threat of terrorism not by creating more terrorism, as the

Bush administration has done in Iraq, but by striking at the very heart of the real terror networks.

SMART would cut off financing for terrorist groups and would break up of their organizations around the world, engaging the international community in this process, the same international community the Bush administration so callously disregarded in its march to war.

SMART security provides a better path for America than the one we are currently on. Could DICK CHENEY be President? Sure, if you do not mind the fact that the real President is asleep at the wheel, but JOHN EDWARDS, who could step in for JOHN KERRY on a moment's notice, will not be a shadow President because JOHN KERRY will lead this country on a truly smart path.

The voters will decide in November what they want: an administration that unnecessarily sent American troops into a war that has cost the lives of thousands, or a Kerry-Edwards administration that will be smart about America's national security.

ELECTIONS, NOT FEAR, MAKE AMERICA STRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, elections, not fear, make America strong.

I just returned this afternoon from my district. All last weekend, everywhere I went in Seattle people kept asking me the same question, are they really going to take away our election? Now, I did not go to the secret briefing that they had last week. It is my practice and my policy not to go to secret briefings.

The day after the briefing, however, there was a stunning administration press conference revealing that the Department of Homeland Security thinks we should all be more afraid but that things are not bad enough to raise the terror alert level from yellow, and we should all be vigilant, but not about anything specific.

Now, that secret meeting that they had the day before had everybody's mouth zipped shut in this place. Then they go out on the street and say what they told us not to talk about; and, by the way, we need to figure out how to legally delay the election, just in case. That was the bottom line, what they were talking about. The homeland security spokesman referred to this as an effort "to determine what steps need to be taken to secure the election." Please, folks, could we not at least avoid the Orwellian language?

Now we have got the people flooded with fear, and the conspiracy theorists are having a field day. It is everywhere, in all the clips today in the paper, everywhere all across the country just

what was going on in my district. I did not know where it came from, but when I got back to Washington and read what was going on nationwide, it is everywhere.

How does this contribute to our national security? How does it do anything except keep everybody off balance and crazy?

This ratcheting up the level of alarm is always followed by a pause though there is no change in the evidence or lack of evidence of a terrorists' ill-intentions and the relaxation of the tension is always followed by another call to fear.

There really are people out in the world who want to hurt us. Let us direct our attention to them. Let us work on the problem, instead of working on the nerves of the American people.

I do not want to anticipate that the Department of Homeland Security is going to fail. I want the Department to do everything possible to make us and our elections safe.

So I have some advice for the Department of Homeland Security, Madam Speaker. Stick to your knitting; try to keep the homeland secure; analyze the chatter; do not chatter yourself; do not add to the noise; do your job; do not stir up fear.

We are a vast and strong Nation. For the people in our government to be saying that if there is a terrorist event we will get rid of the election, excuse me? They do not do that in India. They do not do that in Germany. They do not do that in any country. You are acting like one event somewhere in this country is going to give the President the right to call off the election. Absolutely nonsense.

We got through the British burning the White House and the Capitol, this very building was burned to the ground in the War of 1812, without suspending an election. We got through the Civil War without suspending an election. You can go downstairs and see pictures of troops bivouacked on the campus of the Capitol, but we had an election in 1864. Some people thought it should be delayed, but it went right ahead. In a democracy you do not have to be afraid, and we will get through the election of 2004.

The Presidents who made these decisions to go ahead with the election, despite threats, were fighting ground wars right here in D.C. and in its suburbs, not 8,000 miles away. They had it right on their doorstep, but President Madison, who wrote most of the Constitution, and President Lincoln, who saved the Union, believed in this country and in its people. They believed that people would persevere and prevail, and that is what I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Members of this body and our administration to repudiate this fear mongering, the rumor generating, the chatter about delaying our elections. What kind of nonsense is that for the leadership in this country to be even talking about? It insults our

intelligence. It distracts us. It harms our country. It is ill-befitting of this American democracy that we are all so proud of.

NORTH CAROLINA'S FAVORITE SON, JOHN EDWARDS, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL TICKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, this evening I rise with several of my colleagues and a number from my North Carolina delegation to talk about our favorite son, JOHN EDWARDS, as well as our ticket.

JOHN EDWARDS is from a little place in Moore County called Robbins, North Carolina. He currently resides in our State capital of Raleigh.

I normally do not respond to things some people say on the floor, and I find it a bit of interest earlier that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle knew so much about him, they wanted to quote from the Wall Street Journal. There are a few people in North Carolina who read the Wall Street Journal, but if he really wants to know about JOHN EDWARDS, I would suggest he read the Raleigh News and Observer, probably the Charlotte Observer or a lot of our weekly papers, and he would find a lot out about JOHN EDWARDS.

If he had been in Raleigh on Saturday, he would have had the opportunity to see about 20,000 people standing in the hot July sun, over 90 degrees for 4 hours, to welcome home JOHN EDWARDS and Presidential nominee JOHN KERRY and their wives Elizabeth and Teresa to Raleigh, North Carolina. It was a wonderful celebration of the first North Carolinian on the Presidential ticket in modern times.

I will have more to say about this in just a moment, but first I want to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), for some comments.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be here tonight. I did not think I would be pleased to be here. In my office earlier, I was regretting greatly having agreed last week to come down tonight as I saw the time slip away and as I was, instead of dinner, eating the complimentary North Carolina peanuts that we pass out to our visitors, wondering when, if ever, tonight I would get dinner.

Then I heard the speeches of a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and by others on the same topic but from a different perspective, and I felt a new energy and a new enthusiasm for our task tonight, and I would like to address some of the questions that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the others asked about JOHN EDWARDS.

First, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) asked why it was that JOHN EDWARDS did not have to answer any of the insulting questions that were asked of Dan Quayle when the first President Bush asked him to run as Vice President in 1988, and I think that there is a simple answer to that.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said that Dan Quayle had been in Congress for 12 years, JOHN EDWARDS in the Congress for only six, but JOHN EDWARDS had not been asked why he was qualified to be President when that question was put very pointedly to Mr. Quayle. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said he believed it must be because of the liberal media. I think there is a different explanation.

JOHN EDWARDS is smart. JOHN EDWARDS is smart. Everyone knows he is smart. Everyone who has spent any time around him knows that. He is plenty smart enough to be Vice President. He is plenty smart enough to be President.

Second, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and all the others said that this is a ticket of two crazy liberals, wild-eyed crazy liberals, out of step with North Carolina or even, they suggested, with Massachusetts, and I just wish they would get their story straight.

JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS are the Huck Finns of American politics because they got to attend their own political funeral. In December of last year and early January, they appeared to be politically dead. Their campaigns were not going anywhere. The former governor of Vermont, Howard Dean, appeared to be walking away with the Democratic nomination. A respected political reporter here, Stuart Rothenberg, wrote a column that said, "It ain't over till it's over, but it's over." Howard Dean was assumed to be the nominee.

So all the right-wing commentators began talking about how the Democrats were going to nominate a crazy liberal in Howard Dean; and, to establish that contrast, they said the Democrats were rejecting sensible, thoughtful, moderate candidates like JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. Things did not go according to their script, and now the ticket is JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS, and those same thoughtful, sensible, moderate folks that just a few months ago they were praising, they now are tarring with the same brush that they tarred Howard Dean.

Also, they need to get their story straight because just last week, in the hours immediately after JOHN KERRY had announced that he had asked JOHN EDWARDS to run on the ticket with him, the first response from the Bush-Cheney campaign was a 26-page e-mail that outlined all of these differences, all these differences between KERRY and EDWARDS, they just had nothing in common, and it just showed how flagrantly political JOHN KERRY was to have asked someone with whom he