

really, he should be coming to help us. He should be coming to release the dollars that I had voted for here at the Federal level, and, most of all, helping us with job creation.

He is landing in a major corn producing State in Ohio. He could be helping us with transitioning America to fuel independence. Our farmers want to build ethanol plants and biodiesel plants in order to help this Nation break its dangerous addiction on foreign petroleum. Why does he not help us? When over 60 percent of the petroleum that fires this economy is imported from some of the most dangerous places in the world, we need his help.

Our State has been devastated by Republican economic policies at the national level and at the State level. Community after community has seen its jobs destroyed. The soaring Federal budget deficit and unemployment ranks deserve the President's attention. I am just so sorry he could not help us with job creation and workforce development when he visited our district today.

[From the Toledo Blade, Jan. 21, 2004]

OWENS LAYS OFF TRAINING EMPLOYEES
BEFORE BUSH'S VISIT
(By Ryan E. Smith)

Just days before President Bush's visit today to Owens Community College to tout job training programs at such two-year schools, at least six Owens employees who handle work-force development have been given pink slips, The Blade has learned.

The timing of the news, so near the presidential visit and expected speech about proposed federally funded job training grants for community colleges, was not lost on Kathy Munger.

Ms. Munger, who has worked at Owens for seven years, is one of those given a pink slip. "It's very ironic," she said.

Although some of those who received the two-week notices on Friday may be able to relocate in other departments, Ms. Munger, a training coordinator, and three other employees interviewed by The Blade said they will no longer have jobs.

"I've been informed that my position has been eliminated," said Pam Pullella, director of special projects who has been employed at the college for 25 years and started there as a student in 1978.

"I'm five years from retirement," she said, "I really had thought that after all this time I'd finish my career at the college, and I'd still be a benefit. It's just really hard for me to believe."

Others with the college's Center for Development and Training who confirmed to The Blade that they have received pink slips were Dr. Joseph Conrad, director of health and wellness; Jim Kronberg, director of spatial projects; Donna Brecht, records specialist, and Veronica Rice, records specialist. All work on the Perrysburg Township campus except for Mrs. Brecht and Ms. Rice, who are part of the college's Findlay operation.

Owens President Christa Adams called the personnel action a "realignment," but could not say last night whether any of the movement would result in layoffs.

She and other officials were busy preparing for the President's visit and could not be reached for further comment.

Earlier in the day, Owens officials refused to discuss any of its work-force programs with The Blade.

The affected employees who spoke with The Blade said they believe the cuts at the Center for Development and Training are not the only ones to occur at the college. They said they were given no reason other than restructuring.

Dr. Conrad, who has been at the college for almost eight years, said he worries about whether the programs will be able to function adequately with the reduction in personnel.

"It has to be detrimental," he said. "We don't have the manpower to continue the level of service to the community."

Mrs. Brecht, 40, who said she helps put together classes and make sure there are enough instructors, indicated the move will leave Findlay's Center for Development and Training with only half its manpower. She said she will not be bumped to a new position because she is the "low man on the totem pole."

TOLEDO, OHIO.—President Bush promoted his job-creation and worker-training goals Wednesday in Ohio—a state hit hard by manufacturing losses and one that is key to his 2004 campaign.

Hours after his State of the Union speech, Bush touted his proposal for new job-training grants channeled through community colleges at one of the state's fastest growing community colleges.

He called for \$250 million for programs to match workers and employers during his speech at Owens Community College.

"There's no better place to do that than the community college system," he said.

In addition to offering classes that help workers learn a new skill, community colleges often work with businesses to train their workers to use computer software or other skills.

"It's what we're all about," said Terry Thomas, executive director of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, which represents 23 technical and community colleges.

But he added that there has been little funding for work force development, so any money from the government would help.

Owens Community College has seen its enrollment increase for 26 consecutive semesters. It now has about 40,000 full- and part-time students at its campuses in Toledo and Findlay.

Job training and counterterrorism proposals were among several plans Bush said Tuesday night that he would offer in his 2005 budget—a blueprint to be released Feb. 2 that will be constrained by record deficits expected to approach \$500 billion this year.

Even as Democrats scrapped among themselves over who would oppose him in November, the State of the Union address touted his administration's successes: the toppling and capture of Saddam Hussein, revival of economic growth, and passage of major tax cuts and a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

The address contained few major new proposals, underlining the limitations of a budget burdened by deficits and a campaign year in which far-reaching legislative accomplishments probably will be hard to come by. After calling last week for a resumption of human flights to the moon and eventually sending astronauts to Mars and beyond, Bush didn't mention space exploration in his speech.

From Congress to the presidential campaign trail in New Hampshire, where next week's presidential primary will be held, Democrats balked. They said Bush had ignored the job losses, ballooning budget deficits, diplomatic reversals and growing ranks of Americans without health insurance that have characterized his administration.

Bush touted a cluster of issues sure to energize conservative voters who are the core of the Republican Party.

He said he would support a constitutional amendment defining marriage as being between a man and a woman if courts struck down a law mandating that. He asked lawmakers to renew expiring portions of the USA Patriot Act that strengthen the investigative reach of law enforcement agencies, double funds for abstinence education and codify his administration's award of federal grants to religious charities.

He also took a swipe at Democrats who have challenged the path he took in Iraq, who have said his tax cuts were an unnecessary boon to the rich and that his Medicare expansion and education initiatives were inadequate.

He said the nation needed to stay the course against terrorism and admonished those who would "turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us."

"We have not come all this way—through tragedy and trial and war—only to falter and leave our work unfinished," the president said.

By far, the most expensive proposal in his speech was one he has made repeatedly: Making his already enacted cuts in personal income and other taxes permanent. That has a price tag estimated at \$2 trillion, and an uncertain fate in Congress, considering projections for year after year of huge budget deficits.

Bush also called for more money—likely to be relatively small amounts—for spreading democratic institutions abroad, helping students performing poorly in math and reading, training prisoners for future employment and testing for drugs in schools.

He proposed tax breaks to help low-income people afford health care, and renewed his call to let people divert part of their Social Security taxes into retirement accounts whose investment they would control.

Congress is unlikely to touch an overhaul of politically sensitive Social Security at least until next year, after the elections.

RESPONDING TO STATE OF THE
UNION MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, like many of my Democratic colleagues this afternoon, would like to respond, if you will, to the President's State of the Union address, which, of course, he gave to the Nation last night from the House podium just right behind me here.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, thanks to what I consider extremist policies of President Bush and the Republican leadership here in Congress, the priorities of the American people, priorities of good jobs, better access to healthcare and the best education for our children, are not being addressed, either at the White House or here by the House Republican majority, and certainly the President's speech last night did nothing to convince me that any of these priorities will be addressed in the forthcoming year.

The problem, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is that President Bush and Congressional Republicans continue to cater to

America's elite, to the wealthy. There is no doubt our Nation's millionaires have fared well over the past 3 years under President Bush and the elite have seen their taxes dramatically cut. But the hard-pressed middle-class face a weak job market that, thanks to President Bush's economic priorities, show no signs of improving in the immediate future.

So even though the President talks about economic recovery, it may be economic recovery when you look at the stock market quotations, but it is not when you look at jobs and the possibility for real job creation that would actually help the average American.

The President's efforts to provide billions of dollars in tax breaks to our Nation's millionaires will saddle our children and my children with massive deficits. So not only is his policy not creating jobs, but his policy is creating more and more debt.

President Bush and the Congressional Republicans have squandered historic budget surpluses. When President Bush took office, we had a surplus for the first time under President Clinton. But because of the collapse of fiscal discipline, now we are faced with a \$5 trillion national debt over the next decade, which has been brought about, in my opinion, by President Bush and the Republican policies here in the Congress.

One only has to revisit the President's last two State of the Union addresses to realize how out of touch the President is with what policies will really jump-start our Nation's economy. I would like to spend a little time this afternoon trying to compare some of the statements that President Bush made in the last couple of State of the Unions before last night to try to point out how really out of touch he is, and how what he mentioned last night is not going to get us to where he says we are going to go.

Two years ago, President Bush touted his second round of tax cuts by declaring in his State of the Union address, "My economic security plan can be summed up with one word: Jobs."

Instead of creating jobs, on President Bush's watch, our Nation has witnessed the greatest job loss in a recovery since the Great Depression of the 1930s. A few months of modest job creation that we have had over the past few months cannot hide the abysmal performance of the labor market over the past 3 years.

According to a State of the Union report from the Center for American Progress, long-term unemployment is close to a 20-year high because the labor market is so weak. The labor force participation rate in December 2003, just this past December, was at its lowest level since December 1991, a dozen years ago.

At every turn, the President has passed up opportunities to pass what I call high-bang-for-the-buck stimulus to jump-start job creation, and instead favors inefficient, ineffective, long-term tax cuts for the most well-off.

If you really want to create jobs, then you use the Federal budget and the power of the Federal Government to stimulate and jump-start jobs, job creation. Instead, we have this inefficient, long-term tax cut proposal which, as you heard last night, the President wants to continue, and, according to the Center for American Progress again, the report, in 2002, with our economy in desperate need of a jump-start, the administration pushed to retroactively eliminate the corporate alternative minimum tax, a provision which would have provided a \$254 million tax break to Enron. But what did it do for job creation here in the U.S. for the average guy? Nothing.

Let us consider the words that President Bush spoke last year during his 2003 State of the Union address. Again, we are going to go back one year. He said, "We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other presidents and other generations."

That is what he said a year prior to last night. But, despite this promise, President Bush's policies over the last 3 years led our Nation to a record \$450 billion deficit. This deficit is a major problem in terms of job growth, job creation, and even the long-term stability of the economy. Everyone recognizes that the President and the Republicans pushed up the debt to unheard of heights.

Again, I want to put this deficit problem in perspective, to go back to this report from the Center for American Progress. It found in the report that 5 years from now the average family's share of the national debt will be more than \$84,000, compared to a projected \$500 per family when Bush took office.

So when the President took office, the national debt, if you look at it per capita, was very low. We were actually in a surplus. We just had a national debt that had been inherited from before, but we were actually in a surplus. Now that national debt has grown to more than \$84,000 for the average family's share. It is an incredible figure when you think about it, and it makes it really impossible for us to talk about the Federal Government playing any kind of role to create jobs or to improve the economy when we have such a huge deficit.

Our Nation's fiscal situation is so dire that the International Monetary Fund issued an unusually strong and stark warning about the threat that rising fiscal and trade deficits in the U.S. pose to the financial stability of the world economy. This was just a couple weeks ago when the International Monetary Fund issued this warning.

In a departure from what he previously had said, the President last night, if you took notice, actually did say that the deficit was a problem. I think he finally came around to the point where he cannot just ignore it, because if you think about it, prior to last night he was saying, "Oh, it

doesn't matter. We can continue to have larger deficits, growing deficits. It doesn't make any difference."

But last night he finally acknowledged the fact that the deficit was a problem, and he did express concern over the size of the deficit and he basically reasserted his commitment to cut the deficit in half in the next 5 years.

But that is, again, his rhetoric. He is saying that, he is acknowledging for the first time in the last 3 years that the deficit is a problem, and he is saying he wants to cut it in half over the next 5 years, but if you look at the policies that President Bush put forward last night, the reality is they are only going to increase the deficit. They are not going to cut the deficit, they are going to increase the deficit.

Again if you go back to this report from the Center for American Progress, the President proposed at least \$3 trillion in new tax cuts last night and spending over the next few months. So between the tax cuts that he talked about last night and the new spending he talked about last night, we are talking about a huge increase in the deficit, not a decrease.

I can say that, and I would like to detail a little more this afternoon why I say that what he is proposing last night in terms of tax cuts and new spending is going to increase the deficit rather than cut it in half over the next 5 years.

First let us talk about the \$1 trillion proposal to privatize Social Security which the President mentioned. I have to tell you that I do not like the idea of privatizing Social Security in any way. I do not think the whole idea of privatizing Social Security is a good thing, but the President mentioned it, and I want to give you the fiscal consequences.

Partial Social Security privatization under the President's proposal last night would, all by itself, require at least \$1 trillion in extra funds over the next decade. That is from the New York Times yesterday, January 20.

What about the new tax cuts? The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cost of President Bush's proposals last night to make his tax cuts permanent at roughly \$1 trillion. That is from the Washington Times, September of this year.

What about the mission to Mars? He did not mention in his speech last night the mission to Mars, but he has, over the last week, talked about how he wants to propose this mission to Mars. While the White House has tried to fudge the total cost of the Mars proposal, a similar proposal was floated way back in 1989, over 20 years ago, and at that time the cost was projected at \$400 billion to \$500 billion. With inflation, that is about \$600 to \$700 billion today. Again, where is that money going to come from, without us going further and further into debt?

He also proposed a missile defense system. Despite a GAO report advising against moving forward with an untested missile defense system, the Bush

administration is moving forward and they talk about a missile defense system that would cost as much as \$273 billion. That is from a GAO report of June earlier this year, the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

Also the war. Again, the President made his presentation about the war in Iraq and the war against terrorism and linked it to it. But on top of the \$166 billion already spent on the war in Iraq, the President is expected to propose a \$50 billion supplemental bill to pay for Iraqi war costs. The bill probably will not come up maybe until after the November election, but that is another \$50 billion for the war in Iraq, which, again, is costing us a tremendous amount of money and driving us further into debt.

Lastly, and I know in the scheme of things you might say this does not add up to much, it is only \$1.5 billion, but the President's proposal to promote marriage, Bush administration officials have been working with various conservative groups on this proposal, and it would provide at least \$1.5 billion for training to help couples develop interpersonal skills that sustain healthy marriages. That is from *The New York Times* last week.

Well, again, maybe \$1.5 billion does not sound like much in the scheme of things, but \$1.5 billion to promote marriage? Promotion of marriage is certainly a good thing, but do we have to spend \$1.5 billion and go further into deficit to promote marriage? I do not think so. I do not think that is a good expenditure of Federal funds.

So my point is, the President addressed the issue of the deficit last night. He said he is going to cut it in half over the next 5 years, but everything he proposed last night, tax cuts, spend in various areas, all adds up to a significant increase in the deficit. So the rhetoric does not go along with the reality.

How can the President say he plans to cut the deficit in half at the same time he proposes \$3 trillion in new tax cuts and spending? I think he has got to level with the American people. The only way he can really address the skyrocketing deficit is to roll back the components of his tax cuts that, again, as I said earlier, in my opinion, disproportionately benefit the very wealthiest.

The President's suggestion that his tax cuts have been only a minor factor in the fiscal deterioration, actually he said the opposite, that the tax cuts have been a factor in turning the economy around, I would say they have been actually a major factor in our fiscal deterioration and certainly in the deficit creation. They are the largest single contributor to the deterioration of our budget outlook.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the President's speech, keep these statements in mind about what he said in the past in his State of the Union versus what he is saying now, and I think he has a long way to go to prove

to the American people that his economic proposals will not only benefit the wealthy, but also middle-class Americans.

I wanted to spend a little time, I know some of my colleagues earlier this afternoon talked about the ill-fated Republican Medicare prescription drug bill, and, again, the President touted that last night and said how great a thing that was. I have to be honest and say that I think it was pretty obvious if you looked around the room last night, around the House Chambers, that his Medicare prescription drug bill fell on deaf ears.

Obviously since it was passed back in November and the President took it to the people, and our colleagues on both the Republican and Democratic side went home, they found, to no surprise of mine or most of the Democrats, that this was not a proposal that people felt was accomplishing anything, and, in fact, might actually hurt Medicare because of the effort to privatize.

□ 1400

So when the President talked about his prescription drug proposal last night, I noticed there was very few applause, even from the Republican side of the aisle; and I do not think anybody stood up. I think it is testimony of the fact that both sides of the aisle think it is not a good proposal and that the public does not like it.

Now, what is the reason? If we think about it, what they did was to suggest they were somehow giving people a prescription drug benefit when in reality what they were really doing was changing the Medicare program for the worse. If we look at the actual coverage for prescription drugs for seniors under that bill that was signed into law a month or so ago, it provides woefully inadequate prescription drug coverage.

There is a giant gap in coverage in which seniors receive no assistance with costs between \$2,200 and \$5,100 annually. About half of all seniors will not have any drug coverage for part of the year. It does nothing, the Republican Medicare bill does nothing to reduce the cost of prescription drugs. The bill prohibits Medicare from using the bargaining power of 40 million seniors to negotiate lower drug prices, which we are going to see as the drug companies continuing to reach huge profits, and yet seniors will continue to get the major price increases which at times have amounted to 18 percent annually on the drugs that they need just to remain healthy.

In addition, the Medicare bill forces seniors into private plans through either HMOs or PPOs. The other day the President announced he was going to give the HMOs and these private health plans a huge influx of money to try to entice them back into the Medicare program. But I have to tell my colleagues that in my own State of New Jersey, we have had 200,000 seniors in New Jersey that were dropped by HMOs

pursuant to Medicare in the time since the HMOs were allowed to participate in the Medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I think the bottom line is that we lost a tremendous opportunity last year to pass a prescription drug bill that would actually be meaningful for seniors. We as Democrats simply proposed expanding Medicare to include prescription drugs. One would stay in their traditional Medicare, one did not have to join an HMO, and we would expand Medicare in the same way that we provide coverage now under part B for doctor bills. One would simply pay \$25 a month. One would have a \$100 deductible. Twenty percent of the cost of drugs there would be a copay, and the other 80 percent would be paid for by the government. And the Democratic proposal would have specifically mandated that the administrator of the Medicare program bargain to reduce costs for prescription drugs to the average senior.

But we tried that. The Republicans rejected it. We are now faced with this essentially worthless Medicare bill that does not really do anything to help seniors with their drug bills.

The last thing I wanted to do today, and I see one of my colleagues is here and I would like to have him join me, but the last thing I wanted to say is in the time when we were back in our districts in December over the Christmas holiday and New Year's, the one issue that continued to rise to be brought to my attention, to be raised by my constituents was the increased cost of health insurance. We know that more and more Americans do not have health insurance; but even for those who do have coverage, because they get it on the job or if they have to buy it on their own, are very concerned about the rising costs and the fact that they may not be able to afford health insurance or their employer might not provide it in the future.

So that is why the President last night mentioned the crisis and said that there was a problem out there, but what he failed to mention is that the situation has gotten worse. There are about 4 million Americans that have lost their insurance coverage in the last 3 years since President Bush has been in office. If we think of what he proposed last night, a \$1,000 tax credit is really going to be meaningless for most of those who do not have insurance now. We know that if you do not have health insurance and you want to try to go out and buy it on the private market, a \$1,000 tax credit is not going to be any significant help to you.

So the President's proposals last night, whether they were the affiliated health plans or the tax credit, is basically the same old proposals that he has been shuffling around for the last 3 years or so; and they are not going to do the job of providing Americans with health coverage, neither those who do not have health insurance or those who are afraid of losing it.

Again, I worry, because I see the President talking about the problems that are out there, suggesting that somehow he is going to do something about it; but when we look at the specifics about what he is going to do or what he is proposing, it does not add up to any meaningful effort to provide health insurance, to increase the number of jobs, to reduce the deficit, all the things that are so much of a priority right now.

Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, is here; and I would like to yield to him.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the President's State of the Union address last night. From where I was sitting, my perspective, I am from Michigan, from the northern half, and I was really surprised that the President never mentioned the urban areas of this country. About 60 percent of the people in this country live in cities. He did not articulate any type of a plan or approach to help those areas that are dealing with many, many problems. Especially since the National Conference of Mayors is in town this week, I thought at least there would be some mention about urban areas: what can we do to help them with their urban sprawl, with infrastructure needs, green space, or even just helping them cope with these homeland securities which cost these cities millions of dollars. When we get elevated from yellow to orange or orange to red, whatever system they are using now, it costs them a lot of money. The cities, like the States right now, are financially strapped for cash. How do they pay for this? If it is a requirement of the Federal Government, should we not just help them out? I was surprised that he did not touch on the cities.

I was also very, very surprised, and maybe it is the record of this administration, that he did not even mention veterans. Why would he not mention veterans? We are creating veterans every day in this country with the war in Afghanistan and Iraq, and he never even mentioned them. Probably because we saw proposed \$20 billion cuts in veterans health over the next 10 years; that is what his budget proposal shows. It would really eliminate and cap the number of veterans who can access the VA system. We have a cap on it right now because there is not enough money in the system. So maybe the President did not want to talk about veterans because his record in that area has not been very good.

So I would hope that we in this upcoming Congress can put a little more attention on the veterans issues. The Democratic Party and the Democrats in their response, and others, I saw coming up with bold new ideas on how to move this country forward. As the gentleman from New Jersey was saying, some of the stuff we have heard over the last 3 years was just warmed over and put in the State of the Union; but we have different ideas, bold ideas,

new ideas that I think are important. It would be my hope that in this session of Congress, Democrats and Republicans can work together to move forward some of these initiatives.

Some of the initiatives that the President did bring up did tweak my interest, let us say, like the health insurance. The gentleman and I both sit on the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and we have both spent a lot of time on that. Homeland security, I thought we would hear more about that, like fully equipping the first responders, the police, the fire, the emergency medical people.

Increased protection on the border. I come from northern Michigan, right there at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, crossing back and forth to Canada. Before September 11, most of our stations were not manned 24 hours a day. We have made some increases. We have more immigration officers, more Customs officials, more border patrols, they are all now under Homeland Security. But what happened was we put money out there to increase the number of people there; but last Labor Day, the first part of September, they were laying people off. They were supposed to be protecting our borders.

So I wish the President would have spent a little more time saying, look, there are some things we should do in homeland security, especially those of us who have a northern or southern border. It is critically important to us. We know all the cargo ships and containers that come into this country by ship or plane or trucks, we are only inspecting 2 to 3 percent of that cargo. We can do better than that with all of the modern technology and equipment we have. It does not cost that much.

There is no reason why we cannot implement a program. We have the technology. We sat through those hearings where they have shown us the technology to look for biological, radiological weapons and environmental weapons that may be in these containers. Why are we not doing it? If we want to talk about really being safe, that is one area we could improve. I mean, a 2 to 3 percent inspection, that means 97 to 98 are going through uninspected, really makes us susceptible to any kind of an attack, bioterrorist, chemical, or nuclear in this country.

So the Democrats have also put forth a proposal to do this, to increase that. That is not asking that much. We even know the cost of these machines, like big x-ray machines that can scan cargo holds and cargo containers. Why are we not talking about that if we want to really be secure here at home?

Taking a look at the economy and jobs, with all due respect to the President, more tax cuts is not going to solve this problem. In the last 3 years, if we take a look at the total package of the tax cuts that have been passed by this Congress, it is about \$2 trillion. And if they really created jobs, our

economy would not be in the slump we have.

Take my State of Michigan, we are a manufacturing State, and we have been hit terribly under these Bush economic policies. Since the President took office, and I am going back now to August of last year when they claimed we had this big increase in the third quarter of last year, well, in my State of Michigan we lost over 130 manufacturing jobs. They are not coming back. Those jobs like Electrolux in Greenville, Michigan, they are going south. They are going south of us. They are taking their tax cuts, and they are going to Mexico and other areas; and it is going to take out about 2,700 jobs in the little town of Greenville, Michigan. Throughout my district, there has been a number of them who have lost jobs. They go south. We have lost 130 manufacturing jobs. Let us face it, they are not coming back.

The President said, well, this tax increase would create these jobs. If we take a look at it, going back to my State of Michigan, 46 percent of the people received less than \$100 with the last Bush tax cut. How does that help anyone, and how does that create new jobs?

Mr. Speaker, we have so many needs in this country, and the Democrats have come up with a proposal to stimulate this economy, to get jobs moving. We actually put forth a proposal, never were we allowed to bring it to the floor for a vote, because the Democratic proposal was a good one. We supported targeted tax cuts. There should be some for middle class and working families, you bet you. We are there and willing to do it. But our economic and tax cut plan would have created 1 million jobs immediately. How were we going to do that? Invest back in our infrastructure, our port security that I spoke of; and we would have done this by taking money out of the trust funds and not add one penny to the deficit, not one penny to the deficit, but create a million jobs, invest here at home, invest in our airports, our water ports, to protect them from terrorism; and we could create jobs doing that; and, again, we would not have added anything to this deficit which is exploding out of sight.

Democrats do have a better way.

There are a number of things that we can and should be doing. We are willing to work with the President, but they also have to be willing to work with us. By that I mean the gentleman from New Jersey spoke a lot about the Medicare bill with the prescription drug plan. We notice when we had those hearings and we had, they call it the conference committee, no Democrats were ever invited to it; we were not even told when they were. So it was not like we got together; we were not even invited to the table to discuss it. In the House here, the person who probably knows more about Medicare and prescription drugs is the gentleman from my home State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He has been here

and been involved in every Medicare bill since Medicare was created in 1965; he was not even included in the discussions or even asked his ideas.

So these proposals, we are willing to work with them, but they have to include us. The tax cut bills, we were not included on that. The Medicare bill, the energy bill which failed in the Senate, we were not included on that. We need better understanding, and we need a better working relationship with this White House and with the majority party in this Congress.

The gentleman from New Jersey mentioned prescription drugs and the Medicare plan. Just getting access to prescription drugs is a battle for many of us. If we take a look at it, our plan, the Democrat plan basically said, use the purchasing power of the Federal Government to help lower these costs; in fact, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Mr. Thompson, negotiate a lower drug price for us so we can pass it on to the 40 million recipients in Medicare so it does not cost them so much. The bill passed by Republicans expressly prohibited it. The bill also expressly prohibits the Secretary or average Americans from going to Canada or Europe to get lower cost prescription drugs.

□ 1415

One are forbidden from doing it. If one are really interested in lowering the cost for the American people and for our seniors, these two common sense approaches, why is not that part of the Medicare bill to keep the cost down?

And I bring up this Medicare and prescription drugs because the President said last night he will give tax incentives to help people to afford health insurance. Well, that is wonderful, but we need some incentives to keep those costs down. If he did not allow us to come together to lower the cost, negotiate lower prices for prescription drugs, is he really going to allow in the bill the associated health plans to allow businesses to come together to negotiate lower prices down? If we look at the track record, the answer is no. If we are not going to do it on prescription drugs, why would we suddenly want to do it on these associated health plans.

If one really takes a look at the associated health plans, why are they somewhat popular? Well, because underneath the associated health plans, there are two major problems. They do not necessarily come and band together. Each small business in that plan is its own entity and can lead it or drop it whenever they want. So we cannot guarantee that unity, the cohesiveness would stay there.

The second big problem with these associated health plans that the President brought up is that small employers, besides cut and run for a better deal, they do not have to follow state mandates. Every State says, look, if you offer health insurance in our

State, here are some basic rules you have to follow, basic things we want you to do: Prenatal coverage, mental health coverage, immunization coverage, emergency room access, things like that.

These associated health plans that the President brought up last night they do not have to do that. They work outside the State requirements. So they can pick and choose in this State we do not want to offer this or maybe we do not want to do a prenatal care. Maybe we do not want the mental health part of it.

So one is paying a lot of money for half a plan as dictated by the insurance industry and not the needs of the people in that State in which one is selling that insurance.

I like the ideas that the President brought up. If they are willing to work with us, I am sure we can work out some ideas. Democrats believe that a health care coverage plan should include all Americans. We believe the health care coverage should be continuous, that one is not wondering from year to year am I going to have the coverage, but there should be a continuation of coverage.

We believe health care coverage has to be affordable for families and individuals. We believe that health insurance should also be something as a society we all can afford.

And last, but not least, we should also make sure that health insurance actually promotes health and well-being like prevention programs, prenatal care, and access to high quality care that is effective, efficient, safe, timely, and patient-centered and is equitable, people are getting a reasonable return for the money they are spending on health insurance. I do not think that is asking too much.

These are some old ideas that are Democrats are willing to put forth: Accessible health insurance, affordable health insurance, make sure it is adequate to meet the needs of the society one is trying to serve and will always be there in the future so someone is not cut as soon as they have a claim.

So, again, we are willing to work with the President, but he has to reach out to include us.

It was interesting, we talked some more about it when the President was talking about the energy bill and how we should do this. And I think he said, if I quote him right, he said something like "I urge you to pass legislation to promote conservation." I notice he did not say, "I urge you to pass an energy bill that is also concerned about our environment." That was left out. I did not find the environment anywhere in the President's nine pages, this little book that we received with his remarks in there. Probably because in the last couple years, we have been fighting on the floor to keep a strong Clean Air Act, keep a Clean Water Act, protect our national forests and oppose drilling in ANWR and some of these other areas, and fully fund Superfund, which

cleans up and reinstates the polluter-pay principle, one of the things we all believe in.

But that Superfund, unfortunately, we used to get a royalty off the oil and gas drilling in this country and a percentage of that would go and fund Superfund. Well, since the new party took over, the majority took over in 1995, we have not put any money in the Superfund. And there are many Superfund sites in the Great Lake State of Michigan. We have many Superfund sites around the State, around our Great Lakes that should be cleaned up.

So if one is going to talk about energy policy, let us restore enough money for that energy policy. At least fund the Superfund to clean up Superfund sites and reinstate the polluter-pay principle. I think that is something we should all be able to agree with at least in principle.

I was disappointed also when the President said the No Child Left Behind Act is opening doors to opportunity to all of America's children. But as we know too often, and ask any school administrator, the Federal Government with the Leave No Child Behind did not fully fund it. For instance, Title I has a shortfall of billions of dollars.

If one takes a look at this last budget, to meet the requirements of this new testing that the President spoke of and all these other requirements that Leave No Child Behind Act, we should fund these programs. We are putting regulations on these schools. They are expected to perform, but yet they are not receiving Federal money to do this. While he may have increased funding for education, it has not kept pace with requirements that the Leave No Child Behind Act is requiring our schools to do. So we would like to see it fully funded.

And I also believe the other thing we should do if we are going to fully fund education from K through 12 is IDEA, Individual Disabilities Education Act. IDEA, the Federal Government passed that before this President was in office, and it was also a promise the Federal Government would fund it at 40 percent. At best, we are funding it at 18 to 19 percent. We are not even funding half of what we promised to fund when it came to K through 12 education. So, again, I think the ideas are there, but one has to put the funding there.

If one is going to do education, if we don't want to leave a child behind, if we want to test them to see if they are meeting the skills, give the schools the resources to adequately do it and not short change them. Unfortunately, that is what has happened in the last few years. In the last fiscal year we are short \$8 billion nationwide to fund education.

I do not disagree with what the President says but let us fully fund the education. So I really think that the President put forth some ideas. I think they fall short in some areas. We are willing to work with him, the Republican party, the majority party in this

House, but they have to include us in some of these programs.

Democrats do have a better way. We do want to see a number of things happen. We want to see, like, homeland security. We talked a little bit about that. But let us fully fund our first response people. Let us improve our domestic nuclear security and protect our communities against a terrorist attack. We can do this by doing inspection of cargo. It is something so simple that we could do, the technology is there. We even know the cost.

We have sat on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and we have laid out the cost and how much every one of these machines are, how many port of entries we have. We have close to 400 in this country where cargo comes in through ships from other countries. We know where. We know what the cargo is. Let us detect and make sure there is nothing coming in here. I think that is of even greater importance now as we have increased activity around this world in terrorism. And it is something we should be able to do. There is no reason why we cannot.

There are so many other things we could do. Like I said, I was really surprised that the President did not even mention them in the State of the Union address. Democrats we believe that we should ensure full payment of both retirement and a disability compensation to a half a million disabled American veteran retirees. We should do that immediately. Right now the way the law is if one has a military disability pension and a retirement from them, they deduct dollar for dollar if one is receiving disability from their retirement pay. They have earned both of them. They should be fully funded. Why could not we do that for them?

We should fully fund the veterans health care. We should permit an increase in bonuses for soldiers in combat. This is interesting. We had the motion on the Floor here during our debate on the \$87 billion for Iraq to provide a \$1,500 bonus for every man and woman who fought in Iraq or Afghanistan. \$1,500 out of \$87 billion. That tied 213-213 and the amendment did not pass. I could not believe it.

And here we are talking about the great job our men and women in the armed services are doing for us. And they do. But give them a little bonus. Most, and I should say a large number of people in Iraq are from the Reserves and the National Guard, they left their good paying civilian jobs when their country called upon them to go fight in Iraq. So we want to give them a \$1,500 bonus to help ease that financial concern at home. And it ended up in a tie in the U.S. House of Representatives. I cannot believe it. That was basically a party line vote. The President and the administration and Republican party will not support us so it ended up in a tie.

There are so many more things we could do. Democrats do have bold new ideas. We would like to be part of the

process. We urge the majority party and the President to work with us. We have a new year here, a new session just starting. We look forward to working with them. But as I said earlier, when we have these conferences and these ideas coming through Congress, all we ask is for an opportunity to have our amendments put forth before this floor, put together a substitute that we would be allowed to vote on. But, unfortunately, as we have seen on these major issues like Medicare, energy bill, the appropriations bills, we are just completely excluded.

That is almost unheard of in a country of this stature which is a true democracy that the minority party, in this case Democrats, representing 49 percent of the country, are not even allowed to put forth the proposals or amendments on the House floor. I know that upsets a lot of people and certainly upsets all of us.

Even if we do not have the votes to pass it, at least let our new ideas come forth on this Floor and be argued and debated and let the American people make up their mind on this legislation.

So I pleased to come down here and join my colleague. I look forward to doing that throughout the year as we have in the past working on this. There are other issues, and I look forward to working with him on them.

We have an opportunity, and I hope the President and his party will work with us, so we can move this country forward because the economy is not where we want it to be. We are struggling. As I said, Michigan alone lost the most manufacturing jobs of any State. We are hurting back in Michigan. We need some help.

There are some things we can do, but another tax cut is not going to jumpstart our economy in Michigan. It may be good for Wall Street, but it is not very good for Main Street where we do create the jobs. We have heard it so many times in the media that this is a jobless recovery. Well, the economy seems to be looking good on Wall Street. And IRAs and even 401(k)s and other things may look a little better, but for folks back home they are not employed, they are not working, it is not helping them.

In Michigan, at the last tax cut we got less than \$100. 46 percent of the people in Michigan got less than a \$100 in the last Bush tax cut. It is not going to help us out. Let us put some people back to work immediately. Adopt the Democratic plan which says we can put a million people back to work immediately by working in infrastructure, roads, bridges, port security, airport security, without adding to the deficit. We can do it by taking money out of the trust funds.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan not only because of what he said today, but also because of all the work he does, particularly on the committee that we are both on, the Committee on Energy and Commerce. But I was lis-

tening to what he said. He was talking about mostly in the context of his State, Michigan. But everything that he said applies to my State as well, and probably to the rest of the country.

One of the things he mentioned that I wanted to comment on was this whole effort to exclude the Democrats. He mentioned that, for example, with the Medicare prescription drug bill we were not invited to the conference to discuss the bill. Even the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the senior Member of the House, the ranking member on our committee, was excluded.

And when I talk to my constituents, and obviously my colleagues have the same reaction, they are shocked to find out that they elect somebody to come down here and just because they are of a particular party, that is, in the majority, that they have so little say. And we witnessed it earlier.

At the end of the day, when we have the little colloquy between the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and usually it is the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on our side about the schedule, today a couple of our Democratic colleagues brought up the fact that the Republicans have refused to even consider a debate on the issue of extending unemployment compensation. And the Republican Majority Leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) made it quite clear that he was opposed to extending unemployment compensation. But it was not enough that he said that he was opposed to it, he had to go further and say that he was not going to allow a debate on it.

And the reason he said, sort of in a sarcastic way, he said something about the fact, "Well, I think the Democrats said we have 208 members on a discharge petition to bring this bill up." And the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, "Well, last I heard, 218 is the majority." So what he essentially was saying well there may be 208 Democrats out there that are signed on and want to debate this issue, but since they are in the minority, even only by 10 votes, we are not debating it. That is the kind of thing we get.

I do not want to disparage him, but this is what we get all the time. The Democrats are not in the majority so there will be no debate. The Democrats are not in the majority so they will not be a party to the conference. The Democrats are not in the majority, so we are not really interested in their point of view.

Particularly last night, listening to the President's State of the Union Address, I noticed that many of the commentators said it was a very divisive speech, that there was no effort to reach out and say maybe we do not agree on this issue whether it is health care or job creation or whatever, but even though we do not agree, let us get together and try to work it out in a unified way.

□ 1430

Never was that suggested. It was almost as if this was my way or the highway. It is a very bad development in the way that we operate around here, and I think it is important that the gentleman mention it. I appreciate that the gentleman mentioned it.

The other thing I wanted to say just in terms of comparing what the gentleman said about Michigan versus New Jersey, so many soft things you mentioned are true for my State as well. I thought it was very glaring that there was absolutely no mention in the President's speech about any environmental concerns, as if the environment did not even exist as an issue. In the past he has always tried to touch upon it a little. Even though he has a terrible record, in my opinion, and has been cutting back on environmental regulation and enforcement, he would at least mention it. It was not even mentioned.

As the gentleman said, my State of New Jersey has more Superfund sites than any other State, and my congressional district has the most Superfund sites in the State of New Jersey. And it is very upsetting to my municipalities because many of these Superfund sites that are terribly toxic, we have one in Edison, New Jersey, that was the site where they produced agent orange, the herbicide, during the Vietnam War. It is in the stage now where they are gradually cleaning it up. But because they are told there is no money left in the Superfund, that may have to stop, actually has stopped on occasion, and then started up again when the money was available.

That is what we are facing, the crisis with the hazardous waste clean-ups because there is no money left from the Superfund because the President did not want to renew the tax on the oil and chemical industry that would pay for the clean-up.

The gentleman talked about the ports. Obviously, one way that is very effective in terms of creating jobs is to spend money on infrastructure, on homeland security. New Jersey, like Michigan, is a State that has a lot of port activity. Most of the cargo that comes into the port of New York actually comes into New Jersey, the majority of it. I have heard from so many of the inspectors about how so little of the cargo is inspected.

We had a situation in December while we were not here in Congress where our governor had to announce that he could not, there was a proposal because of the bad state of the roads in New Jersey to increase the gasoline tax, and he decided not to do it because he knew that a tax increase would probably not pass and there would be a lot of political opposition to it, so he decided not to increase the gas tax. But we face a crisis in our transportation infrastructure.

If we can get an infusion of funds from the Federal Government to help with our bridges and our highways, not

only would we be able to fix them up and make transportation easier; but it would create a lot of jobs, and we do not get this. All we get is more tax cuts and there is no way that, either in the short or the long run, that that is going to be job creation.

The thing that really surprised me, and I do not know where the gentleman stands on this issue, last night the only thing that I thought the President mentioned about job creation was the need for more free-trade agreements. He signed all these free-trade agreements over the last couple of years, and that is a major reason why so many of the jobs have gone south, not only to Mexico but to China and other countries.

Here he is again saying, okay, we need more of these free-trade agreements. Free trade is all right, but we have got to have some kind of a program to enhance our manufacturing base before we just sign all these agreements and let everybody take away all our manufacturing jobs. It is just amazing to me.

We could keep going on, and I do not want to necessarily keep repeating what the gentleman said, but I just want to say that so many of the things that the gentleman mentioned have direct application to my State, and all we keep getting is more tax cuts for the wealthy, more debt. And somehow the suggestion on the part of the President is that that is helping with the economy, when I think it is doing the opposite.

I do not know if the gentleman wanted to add anything else.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman spoke a little bit about the trade agreements. Now they are trying to push the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas. In the past year we have done the Chilean Trade Agreement, Singapore. We have done a number of them, but yet we still see jobs leaving this country.

When we talk about it, everybody says, well, we will enforce the laws that are on the books, but look at what just happened with steel. The International Trade Commission found unanimously, six-nothing, that there was illegal dumping of steel goods in this country. By illegal dumping I mean they are selling it in this country at less than what it cost to produce it in China or Brazil or the Ukraine or wherever it was, and they dumped it here. And the President said, all right, since you have harmed our industry, we will help our steel industry and the iron ore miners that I represent in Northern Michigan. We will put a tariff on it.

That lasted 18 months and the President pulled out of the agreement. Now we no longer have these tariffs again, and you will see steel starting to get dumped once again in this country.

So when the President says, I need more trade agreements to open up the global market and we will enforce the laws, the first one we have seen where

he has actually taken a high-profile case, the steel industry, he is going to hold it for 3 years, 3 years at 30 percent. Three years those tariffs would be on. It would be a 30 percent tariff.

And then what happened half way through it because of pressure from some of our trading partners, the President decides to abandon the tariffs. He promised the steel industry 3 years to get back on its feet. There has been consolidation. There has been more efficiency in the steel industry. Our mines, and I had a couple mines up there, they have consolidated to cut costs to be more competitive. We make the best steel in the world. And we have all worked together.

He said 3 years. We have laid out a 3-year plan to revitalize the steel industry in this country. That lasted 18 months. So when the President says that, with all due respect, he sort of loses a little credibility in my mind when he wants to bring out further trade agreements, not just a Free Trade Agreement with the America which would be all the way down to South America; but he is also talking about a Middle East trade agreement which would include the Middle East, including Iraq. We have had a trade agreement this last year with Jordan.

There are trade agreements all the time. And no matter where you fall on it, you decide for or against them, but when you find clear-cut violations like in the steel industry where the International Trade Commission by a six-zero vote unanimously says, they have dumped illegal steel in this country and hurt our industry, we have a right now to bring in to remedy the situation. The President does it for 3 years, and he pulls out after 18 months.

So I have little faith that any future trade agreements, when there are violations, they will say, oh, we are getting pressure from our trade partners, therefore, too bad. I talked about Michigan. We lost the most manufacturing jobs of any State under this President. Those jobs are gone. Those were good-paying jobs. What do you replace them with? Service industry jobs, minimum wage, jobs with no benefits.

While we are losing these jobs and have record unemployment in Michigan, we are at 7 percent unemployment, what did they do on overtime in the budget bill that we passed here? The reason why many of us did not vote for it, they have a clause in there that you do not have to pay overtime anymore.

One of the hallmarks of employee rights in this, if you work more than 40 hours you get overtime. Under the President's proposal, they will overhaul the overtime rules that would cause in Michigan alone over 300,000 workers to lose access to their overtime pay.

The President says, it does not affect those who have a collective bargaining agreement. Guess what? As soon as that collective bargaining agreement expires, what is the employer going to

say? I do not have to pay overtime anymore. The Federal law has changed; you guys are out of luck.

That is what we cannot have. So, again, we are willing to work with this President. We are willing to work with the majority party. We even bang on their door when they do not invite us to the prescription drug or budget. We bang on the door. And besides sending the Capitol Police, I wish they would ask us to sit down and let us work together. At the end of the day, after we have our voice, after we are heard, whether it is on the House floor or in committee, if we do not have the votes on the proposal so be it. That is the democratic process. But at least give us access to this process. We do represent 49 percent of the people in this country; and, hopefully, after November it will be more than 49 percent.

We just want access, to have an opportunity to have a fair debate with the American people on these proposals, whether it is the President's health insurance proposal, his trade agreements, his environmental policies. We are happy to debate. But do not stick these proposals in these massive omnibus budget bills that no one reads and no one has time to look at, and we run it over to the Senate and rubber stamp it over there and we come back and the President signs it. Because there are many things in there that do affect the well-being of the American people in the gentleman's district and mine. We certainly have a right to be heard on each and every one of those issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree and I appreciate the gentleman coming down here.

I wanted to say one last thing. The manufacturing sector is very crucial in terms of job creation and job retention, for the gentleman's State, for my State, and all over.

The thing that is amazing about it is when I listened to the President last night, when we look at other countries, whether it is Canada or Western Europe or certainly true for China and the Asian countries, they have a national policy that basically dictates trying to create jobs.

If there is going to be a free-trade agreement with Singapore, for example, I am sure that Singapore has figured out how they are going to gain and benefit. If they are going to lose jobs, they will retrain people to create more jobs in another sector.

If you listened to the President last night, it is almost like, that is not my job, that is not my responsibility. He talked about job training, but he did not suggest how job training would be worked in such a way to train for a new job.

We talked about the manufacturing sector. In New Jersey, in my district, we consider ourselves sort of like a little Silicon Valley, the IT sector; health care is a big sector. And even those jobs are now being lost overseas. We have radiologists complaining about

how the radiology is being done in Asia, or the IT sector where the computer jobs are going overseas.

So we have to have some kind of national policy with regard to job retention and job creation. And he does not even mention that. That is not our job. Washington, the President, the Congress have nothing to do with that. So when he talks about job training, I am like, well, what are you training for? You do not give us any details on how somebody is going to be trained to go work for a job that is available. It is very disconcerting.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned throughout this Special Order today, Michigan has lost so many manufacturing jobs, more than any other State. We actually got together, the congressional delegation, and the Democrats in particular, along with our governor, Governor Granholm, and actually put together a proposal, a HELP proposal as we called it: Health insurance, employment benefits, liabilities of the pension fund so they have a pension when they retire, and then a U.S. dollar policy. We laid out a very thoughtful document and sent it up to the White House and the President and asked them to at least comment on it and join with us because no economy in this world can exist without at least a strong manufacturing base; and we are losing it so quickly in this country, especially the last few years.

So we put forth our proposal called HELP. Unfortunately, we have not heard anything back from the White House. I know they have been on break. Now we have the budget wrapped up, so maybe we will take a look at it. But there are, Governor Granholm, some of us in the House and at least on the Michigan Democratic congressional delegation, trying to do something because we feel strongly that if you do not have a strong manufacturing base, service industry is fine, high-tech, all that is fine, but you still need a basic manufacturing base to your country. So we put forth a proposal. Again, we are willing to work with the President on that because we do have to keep good-paying manufacturing jobs here in this country. They cannot all go south, and we have to do some things to help out pensions, health care, employment benefits and the value of the dollar as a big impact on our goods overseas.

So we hope that we can work with this administration and this President in addressing those concerns we have on manufacturing.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree. I just want to reiterate in closing what the gentleman said again about the need to work with Democrats. Really, the hallmark of this administration, and also the Republican leadership in this House, has been to exclude the Democrats and not have us be part of the debate. That has got to change because otherwise I think we will never get to a situation where we can have consensus proposals for job creation,

for health care, on the environment that are really going to be meaningful. I think that Congress suffers from the fact that this bipartisanship has essentially disappeared under the Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again.

AMERICA'S DRUG POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of this Special Order, and I hope to be joined by several of my colleagues, is going to be narcotics policy in the United States and a number of success stories we have had.

We often talk about the problems and challenges as chairman of the Subcommittee on Drug Policy, the committee that has oversight over all drug issues but also authorizing over the Office of National Drug Control Policy, so-called Drug Czar, Director John Walters. We have authorizing and oversight on all drug issues.

Before I get directly into the subject of this Special Order, I wanted to say a few words about last night's wonderful address on this floor and to this assembly.

If the President had included every single thing of importance and everything we have in our budget, we would still be sitting here this morning. So I first want to thank the President for finishing his speech in 60 minutes.

My colleagues were sharing many concerns that I share as well. That is why our budgets are this thick. That is why we debate all year long on appropriations. But the goal of the State of the Union address is to set a basic vision for where our country is headed; and I thought President Bush did a remarkable job of outlining the major challenges that we face.

□ 1445

We are not a county or a city council. We are not mayors. We are not governors. First and foremost, this body and the President of the United States and the United States Senate have to do international policy. States and local governments cannot do things like the challenges we faced after 9/11 in trying to root out terrorism in Afghanistan, root out terrorism in the funding and the harboring of terrorists in Iraq, to try to break up these networks worldwide, and the President definitely had his focus on the one thing that only the President can lead in and that was our national security. He said, very eloquently, after the first World Trade Center attack and the bombing occurred there, the people were served with subpoenas, they went through our court process, but then the terrorist groups came back and hit us even bigger. We cannot just issue subpoenas. We have to tackle the problem head-on.