

that the requirements contained in this bill only apply to food subject to regulation by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). I would like to clarify that wine and other alcoholic beverages are regulated by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau. Subject to a Memorandum of Understanding with the FDA, the Tax and Trade Bureau has primary jurisdiction over the production and labeling of most wine and other alcoholic beverages.

In this regard, the Tax and Trade Bureau is sensitive to the issue of allergens in alcoholic beverages. For example, wine with levels of sulfites over 10 parts per million has been required to state "Contains Sulfites" since 1987. The Tax and Trade Bureau works closely with the FDA in determining whether such labeling is appropriate.

Because of the manner in which wine and other alcoholic beverages are produced, there are significant questions whether substances that Tax and Trade Bureau allows to be used in the production of wine would have any allergenic effect. In this connection, other countries have implemented or are considering additional regulation of allergens in their food supply. Due to the potential impact of this on the international wine trade, research specifically directed to the allergenic effect of certain substances used in production of wine in being conducted in Australia and elsewhere. In light of this research, the industry section of the World Wine Trade Group (WWTG) (an intergovernmental organization which seeks to facilitate trade in wine among its members, including the U.S., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Chile), submitted the following statement to their Governments:

ALLERGEN LABELING FOR WINE

Several countries, including WWTG members countries, have introduced or are considering the introduction of labeling for potential allergens including, inter alia, fish, milk and egg products. The WWTG industry group recommends that any such labeling must be based on sound science.

To date the scientific community has no evidence on the allergenic affects of these products in wine. Australia is currently undertaking extensive research in this area. Therefore, the WWTG industry group urges the WWTG governments to take full account of the scientific findings, expected within 12 months, in formulating or revising their labeling regulations in this area.

I anticipate that the Tax and Trade Bureau, in consultation with the FDA, will take the results of this international research into account in determining whether additional regulations requiring allergen labeling would be appropriate for wine and other alcoholic beverages. Among other things, the Tax and Trade Bureau should evaluate whether any such regulation would create an inadvertent international trade barrier. In this regard, I would like to work with the Chairman and Ranking Member, as well as the author of this bill, to ensure there are no unintended consequences resulting from this legislation.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 741.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (during consideration of S. 741), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-620) on the resolution (H. Res. 731) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4837, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (during consideration of S. 741), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-621) on the resolution (H. Res. 732) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4837) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stenholm moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1308 be instructed to agree, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to a conference report that—

(1) extends the tax relief provisions which expire at the end of 2004, and

(2) does not increase the Federal budget deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very simple motion. The motion calls on Congress to extend

middle-class tax relief without increasing the deficit. There is a broad, bipartisan support for extending the middle-class tax provisions which expire at the end of this year. There is also bipartisan support for the concept of pay-as-you-go to avoid further increasing the record budget deficits facing our Nation. Our motion would put the House on record in support of a conference report that achieves both of these goals.

I strongly support middle-class tax relief. I support extending marriage penalty relief. I support continuing the \$1,000 per child tax credit and the expanded 10 percent tax bracket.

What I oppose is passing those tax cuts with borrowed money and leaving our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

The Blue Dog budget and Spratt budget substitute called for extension of middle-class tax relief offset by suspending a portion of additional tax cuts for upper-income taxpayers.

More recently, a bipartisan group of Senators has put forward a proposal to expand the three middle-class tax cuts for 1 year, offset by an extension of customs user fees and closing corporate tax loopholes.

The question is not whether or not we should provide tax relief to middle-class families. The debate is whether we should do so with borrowed money, adding more debt on top of our \$7.1 trillion national debt.

We should not pay for tax cuts by borrowing money against our children's future. Congress should be required to sit down and figure out how to make things fit within a budget, just like families across the country do every day. If we do not pay for tax cuts by cutting spending or replacing the revenues, every dime of the tax cuts will be added to the debt we will leave for our children and grandchildren.

At a time when our national debt is approaching \$8 trillion and our Nation faces tremendous expenses for our troops overseas, it is irresponsible to continue passing legislation that would put our Nation even deeper in debt.

As of the close of business last Friday, our total national debt stood at \$7,273,792,456,490.62. It appears very likely the debt limit will be reached sometime in late September or October, with the most likely date being early October, and here let me pause for a moment and say instead of working in a bipartisan way, which we could achieve in a heartbeat to increase the debt ceiling, what we continue to face are more and more bills to increase spending and decrease revenue and increase the deficit.

We offer the hand of bipartisan cooperation on this amendment tonight, and in my opinion, if this would suddenly become the leadership's position, we would pass the tax cuts that the folks on this side of the aisle are talking about unanimously tomorrow or the next day, and it would conference out of the Senate.

But instead, it appears very likely the debt limit that will be reached

sometime in late September or October will come and go, and we will have a crisis.

Secretary Snow has publicly urged Congress to increase the debt limit as soon as possible, even before recessing in August, and we should do that. The most responsible thing for this Congress to do is do exactly what Secretary Snow is asking us to do.

As of the end of April, \$1.726 trillion of our debt was held by foreign investors, more than \$1 trillion held by official institutions of foreign countries. Despite this, the leadership of this body is talking about bringing up legislation that would add another \$75 to \$180 billion to that debt. And some folks even have the nerve to say with a straight face they are taking a conservative position.

Those who want to extend expiring tax cuts or make the tax cuts permanent should be willing to put forward the spending cuts or other offsets necessary to pay for them.

Applying pay-as-you-go rules to tax cuts do not prevent Congress from passing more tax cuts. All it says is that if we are going to reduce our revenues, we need to reduce our spending by the same amount.

If Republicans actually mean what they say about controlling spending, you should have no problem with applying pay-as-you-go to tax cuts, because it would force Congress to actually control spending when we pass tax cuts instead of just promising to do so in the future and having what apparently seems to be a good campaign issue.

The problem is that actions of Republicans have not matched their rhetoric. They cut taxes without cutting spending, in fact, increasing spending at the most dramatic rate that we have seen in many, many years. They charge the difference to our children and grandchildren by increasing the deficit. We should provide tax relief to working men and women, but we must do so without increasing taxes on our children and grandchildren. That is what the Stenholm amendment to instruct conferees would provide.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very brief about this. This is a similar motion to instruct that we have seen before. The practical result of this motion to instruct is to make sure that a tax increase hits all middle-income families next year.

□ 1930

We have a problem and the problem is when the tax cuts passed into law last July and in the original tax cuts when they passed in 2001, the intention of this body was to make those tax cuts permanent. The tax cut that passed the House originally was that the child tax credits would be doubled,

the marriage tax penalty would be vastly eliminated, and the 10 percent bracket would be expanded, and that that would be the law of the land in perpetuity.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman did not intend to mischaracterize my amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I am getting there.

Mr. STENHOLM. I guess I did not hear what I thought I heard you say.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, I am making a larger point that will come around to the practical effect of this motion to instruct.

The point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that because of an arcane rule in the other body, those tax cuts were made temporary, meaning next year if Congress does not act, the per child tax credits will go from \$1,000 down to \$700. The marriage penalty relief will go away and the marriage penalty will come back into full force which costs the average married couple \$1,400 in higher taxes. And the 10 percent bracket which is income tax relief to low-income Americans will go away and go back to the 15 percent tax bracket.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. You are mischaracterizing my amendment. We are suggesting that the tax cuts be extended through next year. You are describing something that is not going to happen in my amendment, leaving a wrong impression with the people that might be listening to us right now.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, the point I am coming to is that the practical effect of this by saying "does not increase the Federal budget deficit," is to say that this will not, in effect, end up happening. And what we want to do is make sure these tax cuts stay in place.

The point is this, Mr. Speaker, when the House passed its budget resolution, when the House deemed its budget resolution passed, we budgeted for this. We planned for this. It is within our budget, which is also a broader plan to reduce the budget deficit. The point is if you put this emphasis as this motion to instruct is created, it will put a bias in to keep these taxes high. It will put pressure not on reducing spending, but keeping taxes high. That is my concern with the gentleman's motion to instruct.

By saying, "extend the tax relief provisions that expired at the end of 2004 and does not increase the Federal budget deficit," that puts emphasis on keeping taxes high or raise raising taxes somewhere else to make this tax cut extended, rather than putting the emphasis where it ought to be, and that is reducing spending like we budg-

et for in the budget resolution which we have deemed here.

So the points is this: we want these tax cuts to be permanent. It was always the intention they be permanent. By having these kinds of motions to instruct which will have the practical effect, in my opinion, of derailing these tax relief measures, we will have a tax increase on the middle-income family earners.

This is in our budget resolution. We budget for these tax cuts to be made permanent. That is what should happen. That is why I urge a "no" vote on this motion to instruct.

With that, I understand my friend from Texas disagrees with my assessment of this, but that is my assessment. I think that is exactly what would happen if this were to be the case. That is why I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is a fascinating argument. We have heard it time and time and time again. My friend talks about the lack of controlling of spending. Let me remind, Mr. Speaker, you control this House. You control the Senate. You control the White House. All of the great speeches that are made about controlling spending are your responsibility.

This amendment will not stop that from happening. In fact, I suggest just the opposite has been happening because we continue to pay tax cuts but spending goes up. Nothing in my amendment suggests that spending would not go down. If you want to have a tax cut, pass the spending cuts first. Do not just do it on the promise of a theory that so far has not worked. Did not work in the 1980s, has not worked in the 1990s. But yet we hear the same rhetoric; and with all due respect, my colleague mischaracterizes our amendment.

I would be happy to yield at any time to my friend.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. As this motion to instruct is written, number one, under the PAYGO rules that you are advocating, you will have to raise taxes somewhere else to pay for this tax cut or you will cut entitlements because that is how PAYGO works for these tax reliefs.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, I take back time because again you are totally misleading the body when you make that statement.

If you go back to PAYGO as was originally passed in this body in 1990, repassed in 1993, repassed in 1997 with Republican votes for it and Democrats joining, like myself, in putting that in place, it worked. There is nothing in this amendment that suggests that you, the majority party, must cut entitlement spending in order to achieve a tax cut.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Does PAYGO allow for cuts in discretionary spending to be used to pay for tax relief?

Mr. STENHOLM. Yes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I have a different understanding on that.

Mr. STENHOLM. That is the problem. That is the problem. It is a lack of understanding.

PAYGO means you have got to come up with the spending cuts to take care of the amount of tax cut.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman is suggesting that when the budget resolution sets its 302(a) and reconciles its provisions, then the answer is you can put credit on the PAYGO score card to pay for a tax cut. But given the fact that we already have a budget resolution that is deemed, that accommodates this tax relief provision extending this tax cut so that it does not expire, we already have in our budget this budgeted for.

Mr. STENHOLM. The gentleman has misstated the facts again. There is no budget. There is no budget until we get a House-Senate conference and we have a budget. If we had a budget, I would probably be standing up here agreeing with parts of what you are saying.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The House deemed a budget, so we for practical purposes are operating under the House budget resolution which we deemed to be the budget of the House because we could not get a budget agreement with the other body.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, that is precisely why I am standing here tonight offering a solution for the House and the Senate.

There is a bipartisan family tax relief proposal in the other body. It calls for a clean 1-year extension of the present law, \$1,000 tax credit. It calls for the marriage tax penalty relief and the standard deduction, clean 1-year extension of present law so that married couples get twice the standard deductions of single filers. It calls for the 10 percent rate bracket clean 1-year extension. It calls for 1-year acceleration of the scheduled 2005 increase from 10 to 15 percent. It provides for the benefit of the child credit to military families by expanding the definition of earned income.

There is not a bit of this that you are opposed to. We all agree on that.

Now, what my proposal does is the offsets that they put in their bill. The Concord Coalition today has endorsed what this bipartisan group of Senators, let me read the names, Senator SNOWE, Republican of Maine; Senator BAUCUS, Democrat of Montana; Senator MCCAIN, Republican of Arizona; Senator BREAUX, Democrat of Louisiana; Senator CHAFEE, Republican of Rhode Island; Senator LINCOLN, Democrat of Arkansas.

The other body is showing some signs of saying, look, it is time for us to deal

with a very serious problem. If we do not act, these tax cuts are going to become tax increases on the middle-income folks. If we do not act. To act you are going to have to eventually get some kind of bipartisan agreement. You will never get bipartisan agreement by standing up in this body and saying, we passed a budget in this House. Whoopee. We passed one in this House. But you have got to have a Senate concurrence if you are going to, in fact, achieve something that we all agree needs to be done. That is my point.

We can do this. It is not that difficult. Unless you just believe we can borrow unlimited amounts of money.

There are some misconceptions flowing around. I have been in this body now for 13 terms. And when I look at spending as a percent of gross domestic product when I arrived here in 1979 and compare it with spending today, total spending as a percent of GDP, it is one half of 1 percent less today than it was in 1979. Revenue has dropped by 5 percent. The amount of revenue that we have available to fund the programs, including fighting three wars, has dropped by 5 percent; and in dropping the revenue by 5 percent, we are adding to the deficit at an alarming rate.

It does not seem to bother you, Mr. Speaker. It does not seem to bother my friend. As long as we were out here arguing about tax cuts, it does not bother anyone. And why should it? The folks that this should bother are our children and grandchildren, and they have about as much knowledge of this as my friend arguing on the other side here today and they cannot vote. That is the problem. Our grandchildren cannot vote.

Adding to the deficit under a political theory that has not worked, did not work in the 1980s, is not working today, is dangerous to the future health of this country. I believe that.

My friends on the other side apparently do not believe that. And that is fine. As long as you stand up and say, honestly, I do not believe it is going to harm the United States of America that we borrow another 75 to \$180 billion, because tonight I do not know what my friends are proposing in this mysterious conference. Very unusual procedure that we are talking about in doing what no one knows until the leadership deems that it is going to be on the floor, and deems the way it is going to be carried out, and deems the way that it is going to, in fact, effect the future economy of this country.

Now, that is perfectly within the purview of the majority party, to continue to allow business as serious as the economic future of this country to be decided in a very small cadre of Members who happen to be in the leadership. And if you continue to do as you have been doing, you are going to be successful in this body. But then what happens if we cannot get an agreement with the other body?

Why would we not come together tonight and say, okay, we can have a 1-

year extension and we can pay for it, either with the way the Senate has proposed it or by finding some other spending cuts up front. Not doing it like we did it 2 weeks ago, and spending 7 hours in this body debating all these wonderful amendments and then having nothing. Some got 100 votes and some got 105. And that is perfectly within the purview of any Member to stand up and speak for what they are for. But, ultimately, when you are in the majority party you have to accept the responsibility, the responsibility of your actions.

Just as I took the hand of your party in the 1980s when we were in the majority in this body and we worked together for some compromises regarding the economy of this country, we offer that hand tonight. This amendment, if you look at it honestly, again, is a very simple motion. It calls on Congress to extend middle-class tax relief without increasing the deficit. What is wrong with that? I ask my colleagues, what is wrong with extending middle-class tax relief without increasing the deficit? Why are my friends on the other side of the aisle so bound and determined that you want to continue to increase the deficit because you have a theory, a theory, that by cutting taxes without paying for them that it will do something other than increase the deficit?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I was thinking we were going to yield all time back.

I want to be very brief. We do want to reduce the deficit. We are trying to reduce the deficit. I think there is a better way than this vehicle. That is the point I am trying to make.

I do believe there is a difference of opinion on how the PAYGO rules work. But also I think it is important to point out the fact that the tax cuts that took place last year, since then we have actually raised more money in tax receipts under these new lower tax rates than we did last year under the higher tax rates. So the facts are there; but, nevertheless, the point of this is we passed budget resolutions. We have not gotten one with the other body for a lot of reasons, but we have deemed it here. We passed the budget to try to get a handle on spending and reduce the deficit. I would have done even more on spending control in our budget resolution.

This is not the vehicle to do it because I believe this vehicle will make it harder to extend this tax relief; and, therefore, you will have a tax increase on middle-income workers. And I believe the better vehicle to get a hold of our deficit is to pass a good budget that gets down our deficit, that reduces our deficit.

I thank the gentleman for giving me the time.

□ 1945

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I do. I respect the sincerity of the gentleman

and his belief. I happen to believe that he is wrong and is being proven wrong every day by the facts. And let the facts speak for themselves.

That is the whole question today, and this is something that we can continue to argue, but if we do not get some agreements fairly soon, middle-income folks will get a tax increase, and it will not be my fault.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CITIZENSHIP DAY

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 12 our office hosted our 10th annual Citizenship Day event. This is a one-stop application processing opportunity for residents who wish to become U.S. citizens. With the help of local volunteers, elected officials and community-based organizations, we were able to help over 150 residents take their first step to becoming a U.S. citizen. Over 10 years we have assisted thousands of people to become citizens of this great Nation.

The Citizenship Day process involves completing United States Customs and Immigration Service forms, taking photographs, and having volunteer attorneys and U.S. Customs and Immigration Service representatives review the application and actually mailing it that day.

Every year this event can bring tears to your eyes at the number of people who want to become citizens of our great country. While some of us tend to take for granted that we live in a great country, others wait in line all night long simply to submit an application to become a U.S. citizen.

Although an event like this takes many months of coordinating, the rewards are remarkable. Not only does it provide a service to our community, but it increases awareness among legal residents about how important it is to become a citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list in the RECORD all the volunteers and groups that helped us on this event, as follows:

Houston Community College—Northeast Campus, Harris County Constable Victor Trevino, U.S. Customs and Immigration Service, United States Postal Service, JP Morgan Chase, Alma Latina Taqueria, League of United Latin American Citizens LULAC, National Association of Latino Elected Officials, Hispanic Organization of Postal Employees HOPE, Telemundo, Univision, Quan, Burdette & Perez, Attorneys at Law, Hipolito Acosta-Houston District Director of USCIS, Rose Aguilar, Mary Almdendarez, Norma Ambriz, Carmen Bermudez, Graciela Caballero, Rob Caballero, John Cedillo, Mary Closner, Tolanda Crombie, Anselmo Davila, Zonia Davila, Elias De La Garza, Cesar De Paz, Hector DeLeon, Olivia Del Bosque, Raul Diaz, Debbie Dimas, Jaime Elizondo, Armando Entenza, Linda Escamilla, Fernando Espadin, Pedro Espadin, Silvia Espadin, Charles Flores, Tim Floyd, Carmen Galle, Jaime Garcia, Juan Garcia, Rose Garcia, Martina Garcia, Sophie Ha, Krystal Hernandez, Ernest Hill, Amalia Huerta, Natasha Jabbar, Andres Lara, Dorothy Ledezma, Teresa Longoria, John Martinez, Leticia Martinez, Frances Munoz, Valerie Noyoda, Anna Nunez, Isela Obregon, Rafael Palafox, Claudia Pulido, Isabel Ramirez, Sylvia Ramirez-Martinez, Mary Ramos, Christina Ramos Avila, Francisco Rodriguez III, Margaret Rodriguez, Catalina Rosas, Patrese Ruffin-Bush, David Ruiz, Rosalinda Salazar, Noe Sanchez, Cathy Shuler, Teri Smith, Christie Nga, Glida Treadway, Theresa Turnini, Frank Urteaga, Moses Villapando, Juana Wilson.

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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan was running for President in 1980, he asked voters the question, "Are you better off now than you were 4 years ago?" Ronald Reagan won the 1980 election, becoming the 40th President of the United States.

Now, in the year 2004, the disarray of world events and the failed economic policies of the Bush administration

force us to ask of the American people once more, "Are you better off than you were 4 years ago?"

Since he became President in 2001, George W. Bush has enacted the infamous policy of preemption. This doctrine asserts that the United States has the right to attack any country that the President thinks may seek to attack the United States without having any proof to back up that assumption.

Claiming this policy makes America safer against the threat of terrorism ignores the truth, that the war in Iraq has struck a hornet's nest of hatred in the Arab world against the United States for what it sees as a war against Islam.

In his annual budget request, President Bush has pushed hard for billions of dollars to fund an unproven missile defense system and research on new, illegal nuclear weapons. He claims these enormous weapons systems will make America safer against the threat of terrorism, but vast defense spending has squandered money that should be spent at home on health care for the millions of uninsured, on retirement benefits for our Nation's veterans, and funding for new energy sources to stop our dependence on foreign oil.

The time has come for a new national security strategy, and I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism.

In crafting this legislation, my staff and I received brilliant support and counsel from Ira Shorr, from Physicians For Social Responsibility; from Bridget Moix, from the Friends Committee on National Legislation; and Marie Rietmann, from Women's Action for New Directions. Without them, this legislation would not have happened.

SMART security will make the world safer by preventing future acts of terrorism. Because terrorism is an international problem, our response to terrorism must involve the international community.

SMART security emphasizes multilateral partnership because we are stronger when we work together than when we alienate our friends and allies, rejecting their participation, rejecting their help.

The possibility of nuclear weapons falling into the wrong hands is possibly the biggest threat we face as a Nation, and SMART takes the threat of weapons of mass destruction seriously.

SMART takes the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, which has been successful in dismantling nuclear weapons and materials in the states of the former Soviet Union, and replicates this program in other nuclear powers like Iran and North Korea.

It invests not only in new, effective weapons systems and equipment, but in peacekeeping and reconstruction efforts to prevent terrorism, exactly the kind of support that is needed in places like Haiti, Liberia, Sudan.