

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Americans to visit the National Museum of the American Indian when in Washington, DC, and I urge my colleagues to show their support for this very worthy resolution.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate our first Americans on this, the long awaited opening day of the National Museum of the American Indian. If, indeed, the last shall be first, this is a fine example as this museum dedicated to our first Americans is located on the last spot open on the National Mall.

This is a joyous day. At this very moment, thousands of native Americans who traveled from all the corners of our country, Canada, and South America are participating in a procession on the Mall leading to the museum itself. They are dressed in unique traditional attire, stopping along the way to celebrate with dance, song, and drums.

I am honored to say that as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I worked with then Chairman Mo Udall on the legislation to build a museum devoted solely to the culture, art, and history of our Native Americans. Although Mo is no longer with us, I am certain that he is smiling down upon us today.

I encourage everyone to visit this magnificent National Museum of the American Indian and use its resources to learn about the rich history and legacy of Native Americans, as well as contemporary Indian life. I promise your lives will be enriched by the experience.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of today's opening of the National Museum of the American Indian—a historic event that is long overdue. My congressional district contains lands of the Navajo Nation, the Southern Utah Paiutes, and the Northern Ute Indian Tribe—people who understand all too well the atrocities that Native Americans have experienced at the hand of our Federal Government.

The opening of this museum is a bold step toward the United States becoming a nation that understands the history of its people and celebrates the uniqueness of native cultures in its society. My hope is that the museum will help foster and maintain this understanding for “as long as the rivers shall run and the grass shall grow.”

The designing of the National Museum of the American Indian was indicative of the cooperative and inclusive process that the Federal Government should always use when working with Native American tribes. I am proud of the collaborative efforts of all of the people who worked to make this museum a success, and I welcome the many Utahns who join me in celebrating this joyous occasion.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCOTTER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 41.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 41.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS (during debate on Senate Joint Resolution 41), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-692) on the resolution (H. Res. 780) 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. 2028, PLEDGE PROTECTION ACT OF 2004

Mr. REYNOLDS (during debate on Senate Joint Resolution 41), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-693) on the resolution (H. Res. 781) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

UNSCRUPULOUS TACTICS ON MILITARY BASES

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) of the Committee on Financial Services for his leadership in addressing the unscrupulous tactics of life insurance salesmen at our military bases.

During a recent Committee on Financial Services hearing, we learned that greedy insurance companies are selling enlisted men as young as 19 years of age expensive life insurance policies which actually pay out less than \$30,000. These young men and women are forced to attend “financial courses” held by these salesmen who are usually former military men, men that these young men and women look up to.

Young GIs, who are being taught to trust their commanding officers, are

deceptively told they are enrolling in savings accounts and are given papers that they are not permitted enough time to look over. They are ordered to sign here without question.

Protecting those who protect us certainly is a bipartisan priority, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the other members of this committee on this very important issue.

HONORING TOM JOYNER

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to salute our friend Tom Joyner of the Tom Joyner Morning Show for his national campaign of Take a Loved One to the Doctor.

Today, in my congressional district, I had the pleasure of visiting two of our large multi-service centers that are in our communities that hosted health fairs in order for the community to come to medical professionals.

Mr. Speaker, 44 million people in America are uninsured. Our children are losing the valuable CHIPS program in Texas and many other States. This administration is cutting the dollars for children's health insurance programs, and that is why I applaud Tom Joyner for sending out a message all over the Nation for those who are uninsured to come and be tested this day.

I put the phrase, Take a Loved One to the Doctor, but Love Yourself and Go to the Doctor. Mr. Speaker, it is time to focus on the needs of health care of all Americans. We thank Tom Joyner for his understanding and leadership, reaching out with his media to ensure and enhance the life and opportunities of good health for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tom Joyner and the Tom Joyner Morning Show and the staff for their good efforts.

THREE TRILLION IS A BIG NUMBER

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 3 trillion is a very, very big number. Astronomers think there may be a tenth planet 3 trillion miles from the earth. Astronomers are using the biggest telescopes on earth to peer into the darkness of space. Something out there is causing a wobble in passing comets 3 trillion miles away.

But here on earth, the President's plan to spend \$3 trillion over the next 10 years is causing a wobble in the U.S. economy and a black hole in the budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, Members do not need binoculars to see it or astronomers to explain it. It is not a tenth planet; it is

the Republican economics by a Congress controlled by Republicans and the White House. At the rate this economy is going, the phrase "to infinity and beyond" will stand for where the deficit is going; but it is only going to go until the second of November.

PRESIDENT BUSH VISITS OHIO AGAIN

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bush was again in Ohio in the last few days, a key battleground State, again trying to justify a failed economic policy, a policy where we have lost one out of six manufacturing jobs in our State, a policy where we have lost 150 jobs every single day of the Bush administration, yet the President's answer continues to be the same old tired bromides, tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. Taxpayers who make \$1 million a year, they get a \$123,000 tax cut, hoping it trickles down to create new jobs. That has not worked.

The other President Bush answer to bad economic times is more trade agreements that ship jobs overseas. In fact, this body is coming back in a lame duck session in November, probably to try to pass a Central American Free Trade Agreement to expand the failed policies of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we need a new economic direction in my State of Ohio where we have lost more than 200,000 jobs. We need a new economic direction in this country.

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.

DEGRADATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am here to protest what has become a significant degradation of the democratic process in this House. We have a situation in which the House leadership has turned the legislative process into a propaganda arm. With increasing and depressing frequency, we are given resolutions to vote on in a form which does not allow for amendments, and these resolutions contain a mix of the good, the bad and the ugly.

What we have is a pattern of taking sentiments to which all Members of the House or nearly all Members subscribe, sentiments which are quite proper, and

then adding into these sentiments are far more controversial sentiments, sentiments that many of us disagree with.

It is an abuse of the process of democracy to bring forward on this floor resolutions which combine those things with which Members agree with things which are controversial in a form which does not allow Members to even begin to separate them.

There are, for good reasons, parliamentary rules and ways through which Members can express partial agreement. We can amend. We can divide the question. But when bills are brought here under suspension of the rules, as they often are, the legislative process is turned into a political propaganda machine. What happens is Members feel coerced into voting in very large numbers for particular sentiments which could not in many cases get a majority on their own and certainly could not get majorities of the size that they get.

□ 2000

And then having gotten that, people will say, see, everybody agrees with that. Most recently this happened on September 9 when we voted on the resolution brought out of the Committee on International Relations dealing with the terrible events of September 11, 2001; and I will insert this in the RECORD, appropriately marked. It has resolve clauses that we all agree with, but it also has a series of "whereas" clauses which include a number of things which are extremely controversial, in my view, untrue, and unworthy of being put through in this coercive fashion.

Paragraphs 4 and 5, which I have noted on my copy of the resolution, treat the war in Iraq as part of the global war on terrorism. It has been made increasingly clear, most recently by our colleague who is now waiting confirmation as head of the CIA, that statements by administration officials tying Iraq to the September 11 situation were simply not true. Yet this resolution acts as if they were. This resolution implicitly reaffirms the increasingly discredited notion, believed, I think, by almost nobody except possibly the Vice President because he talks about it all the time, that said that there was a direct link between September 11 and Iraq.

And it is wrong to coerce Members to vote for statements that falsely assert this claim because otherwise they will be accused of not caring about the events of September 11.

Then on paragraphs 15 through 21, we have inappropriate celebratory language. If we read these paragraphs, we have solved the problems of immigration and terrorism. We are examining all the cargo. We have taken care of everything. We have "whereas" clauses here that look like part of the President's reelection campaign. He is entitled to a reelection campaign. He is not entitled to take things that belong in a reelection campaign statement and

bundle them into an otherwise non-controversial resolution to coerce people into voting for him.

This congratulates us, for example, that we have extended our borders overseas and to secure and screen cargo before it is placed on ships destined for United States ports of entry. It talks about the great success of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center. Frankly, if one read this resolution and believed it, they would not need the 9/11 Commission report. These paragraphs basically celebrate the accomplishments of what the 9/11 Commission points out need to be done.

We have congratulations to the Immigration Service, congratulations to the FBI, congratulations to the Coast Guard. There are very hard-working decent people trying hard to accomplish these things, but we have not done them yet. These things, if they had been brought forward on their own as statements, would have been rejected, I believe.

It is absolutely wrong to take these inaccurately self-congratulatory statements about the administration's performance and our own performance here in Congress and get votes for them because otherwise people would be accused of not wanting to express our horror of September 11 and our thanks to those who worked so hard against it.

So, Mr. Speaker, because I did not think that the war in Iraq was part of the war on terror, I do not think we deserve to claim "mission accomplished" with regard to the fight against terrorism, I voted against this resolution. And I hope we will stop this practice of giving a bait-and-switch approach to legislation.

H. RES. 757, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S., SEPTEMBER 9, 2004.

Whereas on September 11, 2001, while Americans were attending to their daily routines, terrorists hijacked four civilian aircraft, crashing two of them into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, and a third into the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C., and a fourth was prevented from also being used as a weapon against America by brave passengers who placed their country above their own lives;

Whereas three years later the country continues to, and shall forever, mourn the tragic loss of life at the hands of terrorist attackers;

Whereas by targeting symbols of American strength and success, these attacks clearly were intended to assail the principles, values, and freedoms of the United States and the American people, intimidate the Nation, and weaken the national resolve;

4

Whereas three years after September 11, 2001, the United States is fighting a Global War on Terrorism to protect America and her friends and allies;

5

Whereas since the United States was attacked, it has led an international military coalition in the destruction of two terrorist regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq while using diplomacy and sanctions in cooperation with Great Britain and the international community to lead a third terrorist regime in Libya away from its weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the United States is reorganizing itself in order to more effectively wage the