

will again underscore the importance that votes are counted accurately and that every qualified voter is allowed to exercise his or her constitutional right.

PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY—PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF VOTING IN 2004 AND BEYOND

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON VOTING SYSTEMS AND VOTER VERIFICATION

As the 2004 election approaches, there is significant concern among Americans that our voting system has not been sufficiently protected from a repeat of widespread disenfranchisement. New technologies require election officials to grapple with a complex set of interests, including accessibility for people with disabilities and sufficient security and accountability to prevent elections from being affected by equipment malfunction or tampering.

The enormous logistical difficulties facing state and local election officials in implementing the Help America Vote Act are compounded by limited resources and a lack of guidance from the federal government.

Preventing disaster on Election Day will require a public commitment from election officials at all levels of government—especially chief state election officials—as well as the resources to put in place equipment and procedures that will advance and protect the voting rights of all Americans.

Maintaining the integrity of our electoral process is critical to America's democratic institutions. Providing people with disabilities with the opportunity to vote in an independent and private matter is essential to comply with the moral and legal imperative of equality.

We are confident that there is a clear way forward that will allow states to achieve both goals to the maximum extent feasible for this year's elections, while encouraging additional advances in technology to fully serve the needs of all voters and election officials in future elections.

We believe action by election officials should be guided by four fundamental principles:

1. The voting process, particularly the voting systems and the administration of elections, must be uniform and nondiscriminatory;
2. Voters must be able to independently and privately cast and verify their ballot;
3. Any voting system must comply with national certification standards; and
4. Voter confidence and reliability in the electoral process must be maintained.

Less than ten weeks before the national elections, potential problems with voter registration lists, new and unproven technologies, insufficient resources for poll worker training, and inadequate voter education are increasingly being scrutinized for their potential to rob voters of their right to cast a vote that is counted. These, however, are not the only threats to the integrity of the elections, as a report released by People For the American Way Foundation and the NAACP makes clear.

The Long Shadow of Jim Crow: Voter Intimidation and Suppression in America documents that the vestiges of voter intimidation, oppression and suppression were not swept away by the Voting Rights Act or by subsequent efforts to enforce it. In fact, deliberate efforts to deceive or intimidate voters into staying away from the polls continue to emerge in nearly every major election cycle.

NAACP Board Chairman Julian Bond has been quoted as saying that "Minority voters bear the brunt of every form of disenfranchisement, including pernicious efforts to keep them away from the polls."

"This report is a reminder that while we are keeping an eye on state officials and new voting machines, we cannot relax our vigilance against these kinds of direct assaults on voters' rights."

Poll taxes, literacy tests and physical violence of the Jim Crow era have been replaced by more subtle and creative tactics.

This summer, Michigan state Rep. John Pappageorge (R-Troy) was quoted in the Detroit Free press as saying, "If we do not suppress the Detroit vote, we're going to have a tough time in this election." African Americans comprise 83% of Detroit's population.

In Kentucky in July 2004, Black Republican officials joined to ask their State GOP party chairman to renounce plans to place "vote challengers" in African-American precincts during the coming elections.

Most recently, controversy has erupted over the use in the Orlando area of armed, plainclothes officers from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) to question elderly black voters in their homes as part of a state investigation of voting irregularities in the city's March 2003 mayoral election. Critics have charged that the tactics used by the FDLE have intimidated black voters, which could suppress their turnout in this year's elections. Six members of Congress recently called on Attorney General John Ashcroft to investigate potential civil rights violations in the matter.

This year in Florida, the state ordered the implementation of a "potential felon" purge list to remove voters from the rolls, in a disturbing echo of the infamous 2000 purge, which removed thousands of eligible voters, primarily African-Americans, from the rolls. The state abandoned the plan after news media investigations revealed that the 2004 list also included thousands of people who were eligible to vote, and heavily targeted African-Americans while virtually ignoring Hispanic voters.

In South Dakota's June 2004 primary, Native American voters were prevented from voting after they were challenged to provide photo IDs, which they were not required to present under state or federal law.

Earlier this year in Texas, a local district attorney claimed that students at a majority black college were not eligible to vote in the county where the school is located. It happened in Waller County—the same county where 26 years earlier, a federal court order was required to prevent discrimination against the students.

Last year, voters in African American areas of Philadelphia were systematically challenged by men carrying clipboards and driving sedans with magnetic signs designed to look like law enforcement insignia.

The Long Shadow of Jim Crow also reviews the historical roots of recent voter intimidation and suppression efforts in the days following emancipation, through Reconstruction and the "Second Reconstruction," the years immediately following the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was among the crowning achievements of the civil rights era, and a defining moment for social justice and equality. Yet as The Long Shadow of Jim Crow documents, attempts to erode and undermine those victories have never disappeared. Voter intimidation is not a relic of the past, but a strategy used with disturbing frequency in recent years. Sustaining the promise of the civil rights era, and maintaining

the dream of equal voting rights for every citizen requires constant vigilance, courageous leadership, and an active, committed and well-informed citizenry.

This year, with widespread predictions of a historically close national election and an unprecedented wave of new voter registration, unscrupulous political operatives may seek any advantage, including suppression and intimidation efforts. As in the past, minority voters and low-income populations will be the most likely targets of dirty tricks at the polls.

"Forewarned is forearmed," said Bond. "We are reminding voters, election officials, and the media about the kinds of dirty tricks that can be expected. We must be prepared to confront and defeat them."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle to take heed to the warning of Mr. Bond, for four more years is a very long time and could mean the difference between a safe America and continued war and costly occupation; money for our children's education and failure to utilize affirmative action to bring about equality in education; respect for the U.S. Constitution and continually closing doors to federal courthouses. Four years could mean a very long time if we do not work for change in the administration of our government.

BIG TROUBLE LIES AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCOTTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for half the time until midnight or approximately 43 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it was in The Music Man where the seller of that musical equipment says, "We have big trouble right here in River City." We have big troubles here in Washington, D.C., and in America, for a couple of reasons.

The competition from other countries as they try to copy our techniques of production means that the competition is greater than it has ever been. Our future generations are going to be much more challenged than we have been. Actually, the baby boomers are a generation that is going to start retiring in the next 4 or 5 years; 73 million baby boomers will start retiring, probably the richest retirees that this country has ever had, probably the richest retirees this country will ever have.

We have some challenges in Washington as politicians tend to solve more and more problems, saying, somehow it must be Washington's responsibility rather than the individual's responsibility to solve some of these problems. What we have done is ended up, for example, with a tax system where now, today, 50 percent of the adults in the United States only pay about 1 percent of the income tax. So, of course, there is a lot of that 50 percent who are suggesting that maybe government should solve more of their problems because they do not have a stake in it.

The flat tax or the consumption tax, the sales tax are some suggestions that say, everybody has to have a stake in

the way this country operates and the services that Federal Government provides.

This first chart shows some of the problems of over-promising. What the economists with the green eye shades call unfunded liabilities means the amount of today's dollars that would have to be put in a savings account drawing interest that equals inflation and the time, value of money to come up with the dollars necessary to pay for these programs, over the next 75 years in this case.

□ 2320

If we add up Medicare, part A Medicare; part B Medicare; part D, the drug program; and Social Security, it comes to \$73.5 trillion, according to Dr. Saving, who is the trustee for both Social Security and Medicare, \$73 trillion that would have to be put in a savings account today to earn the revenues in addition to the money coming in from the FICA tax, the payroll tax, to accommodate today's promises. A huge challenge for this government to try to develop the kind of discipline of stopping the overpromising and, for that matter, stopping the overspending. If we add the unfunded liabilities to the debt, the \$7 trillion debt that we have today, added to the \$73 trillion in unfunded liabilities, it means that it is almost insolvable without dramatic cuts in benefits or drastic increases in taxes.

If we do not make some changes, what we see happening in other countries can very well happen in the United States. And that means, Mr. Speaker, take a guess, and I ask my audience to take a guess of what the payroll tax is in France to accommodate their senior population. It is over 50 percent. The payroll tax in Germany to accommodate their senior population has just gone over 40 percent. Of course, that makes them much less competitive. And I am just suggesting, Mr. Speaker, let us not let that happen in the United States by continuing the tendency, the political tendency, because the more we overpromise, traditionally the likelier we are to get a few more votes and get elected to Congress, and if the people that elect us to Congress want somebody there who is going to spend more, promise more, borrow more, tax more, then that is the kind of government we are going to end up having.

Let me just briefly go through this chart of unfunded liabilities. Medicare part A, which is mostly to hospitals, is estimated to have an unfunded liability of \$21.8 trillion. Medicare part B that doctors charge, mostly doctors, is \$23.2 trillion. Medicare part D, the new prescription drug bill that we passed recently, adds another \$16.6 trillion unfunded liability to the cost of Medicare. Social Security is just at 11.9, \$12 trillion unfunded liability for Social Security. That is more than a quarter of a million dollars of unfunded liabilities for every man, woman, and child in America.

How do we shout long enough, hard enough, aggressive enough to get the Congress to pay attention? I think probably the secret is that Americans have to start paying attention to what is happening in their United States Congress, what is happening in their State legislatures, what is happening with their counties as governments at all levels are called on to solve more and more of the problems of individuals.

Let us take a look at the fact that we are going to have a strong economy. I mean, regardless of what we do and the solutions to Medicare and Social Security and stopping the overspending and trying to balance the budget, and, by the way, hopefully in the next several weeks we are going to take up the Balanced Budget Amendment that will add a little more pressure to us to stop our overspending, regardless of what we do, if we do not have a strong economy in America, we are not going to make it. We are going to start going downhill relative to other countries.

The interest on the debt is now over \$300 billion a year, and the interest rate is continuing to climb. In fact, we are still at a very low interest rate; but it is still using up 14 percent of the total Federal budget, and that is growing rapidly for two reasons: interest rates are going up and our propensity to overspend because people do not like taxes, borrowing is sort of putting off the tax increase for a later time, and usually what we are talking about is a later generation.

So we continue to overpromise, overspend, and overborrow. And what that means is a tremendous obligation to future generations, not only coming up with the promises, overpromises, and the unfunded liabilities, but coming up with the additional amount of the budget that is sucked up paying the interest on their debt.

I would suggest that if we are going to have a strong economy, we have got to change our tax system. Our tax system in the United States puts our businesses at a competitive disadvantage. It discourages savings and investment, and that is why I have introduced H.R. 3060, which is a flat tax that ends up taxing at the rate of 17 percent. After the deduction, it taxes at 17 percent across the board. So, number one, everybody has a stake. Number two, it puts our businesses in a more competitive position with other countries in terms of the selling of our product.

Let me talk about our current Tax Code: 7,000 Tax Code changes have been made just since 1986, 74 percent increase in the tax rules since 1986, and they are growing every day. Taxpayers spend 6.1 billion hours, 6.1 billion hours, preparing their tax returns, 8 billion pages of returns every year, and it is becoming more complicated. So people, individuals, taxpayers, do not totally understand how the tax system works. I have heard young people say, Well, I am looking forward to tax day because government sends me a check.

But the fact is they have been taking money away from them on every paycheck, and so the government owes them much more money than they are getting back.

Government estimates of tax compliance costs reach \$183 billion every year. Compliance costs approach 20 percent of the total income tax revenue. Extremely complicated, difficult, takes a lot of time. Businesses adjust their business decisions to lower their income tax often more than the commonsense, logical, market-based decisions they would otherwise make, which makes them more inefficient in terms of being competitive.

I thought it would be fun to just review the total pages of Federal tax rules. As lobbyists and special interest groups come in to lobby Members of the House and Members of the Senate and lobby the White House, they are interested in having special provisions in our complicated tax system that are going to benefit their particular clients. And what this has resulted in is more and more complications, more and more rules, and more and more pages of tax returns that if one is going to understand the system, they have to hire an accountant that is going to spend full time almost on the tax policy.

In 1913, we had very few rules and very few taxes. In 1945, we approached 10,000 pages. By 1984, we approached 30,000 pages. Now we have about 50,000 pages of Federal tax rules that go into detail explaining the laws that this Congress has passed often to benefit some particular interest group.

Just briefly on the flat tax, the flat tax bill I have introduced starts at 19 percent for the first year and then drops to 14 percent the second year and thereon. It is a 17 percent flat rate after the deduction. The deduction is \$36,600 for a family of four. So they do not pay any tax on the first \$36,600 if they are a family of four; 25,000 if they are a couple. It ends the double taxation on savings, ends the double taxation on dividends and capital gains. That means there is going to be a greater incentive to invest and to save. And that is what makes our economy and our productivity grow: the savings investment is the seed corn of the research and development that develops the kind of research and technology that result in better products produced more efficiently.

□ 2330

That is what is going to keep us competitive.

Just as a footnote, I would urge every parent to encourage their kids to make a special effort in science and math. Science and math achievement in the United States is one of the lowest in the world, and probably as technology becomes more an integral part of how we develop more efficient ways to produce products and actually the development of those products, students that have a good background in science

and math are going to be the ones that are going to find it most easy to get a good-paying job.

I think I am down to the fact that it allows individuals to file their returns on a simple postcard form. I printed up that postcard form of what I see as the kind of tax form that is going to make taxpaying very simple and very easy. It increases confidence that everyone pays their fair share.

The flat tax is pro-growth. It is pro-freedom. I think most people in America are sick and tired of the rhetoric that says, well, we are going to make some adjustments here and there. They would like to get rid of the IRS. They would like to have the kind of tax system that encourages them to work and to produce and to save and invest.

Look, when we started this country, that is how our forefathers wrote the Constitution. They said in effect those that work hard, that study, that use that knowledge, that save and invest and try, end up better off than those that do not.

Of course, what we have done in the last 30 or 40 years is we have tended to divide the wealth and take away from those that are successful and give it to those that are less successful. In so doing, we have taken away some of the incentive that has made this country great, and that is the rewards for achievement and the rewards for trying and saving and hard work.

This is the flat tax postcard form. You put down your wages and your salary and your pensions. The personal allowance is \$25,580 for married filing jointly, \$12,790 for a single, \$16,330 for a single head of household. Number of dependents on the next line. Line 4 is the personal allowance. Multiply \$5,510 by each dependent.

What you have left after you subtract those deductions from wages, salary and pension is what you pay your 17 percent tax on. If you paid ahead of time, you subtract the taxes that you have already paid and figure out what government now owes you or what you owe the government.

We are having a lot of debate. Everybody agrees that we should change our complicated Tax Code because of its preferences that have been built in over the years to special interest lobbyists, because of its complication, and because it discourages effort and it discourages learning and it discourages savings.

Should we have a flat tax or sales tax? On the flat tax or sales tax, let me suggest that they both have the same type of tax base and they accomplish the same kind of results as far as encouraging business expansion, good jobs, a fair way to tax.

However, the tax base of a true national sales tax and a flat tax in the fashion of Dick Armey's or Steve Forbes' proposal will be the same. The tax base of a true national sales tax and a flat tax are going to be the same. In both cases, the tax is on consumption and not on investment, which is a

superior tax for economic growth that is going to benefit our competitive position with other countries and certainly benefit the general public.

The question then really is on which tax is going to be administratively most feasible, and the flat tax is the winner hands down. At least 20 years ago, two economists, Hall and Rabushka, laid out the case for the flat tax in detail. The second edition of their book on the flat tax in the mid-1990s is called *The Flat Tax*. In the book they make it clear why the tax base of a national sales tax and the flat tax are the same.

What I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, is both the flat tax and the sales tax have the same tax base. They both accomplish the same goals. So now we are trying to decide which one is more possible to replace this complicated Tax Code that we have now. Let me give you a little intuition on why both of these taxes are essentially both the same.

The tax base of a flat tax is income, but people only do two things with income. They either spend it or they save it. Since there is no tax on savings, this means the flat tax is on consumption. But this is the same as a sales tax.

Let me try to be a little more technical. I started trying to work out an alternative to Michigan's sales tax as a flat tax when I was chairman of the senate finance committee back in Michigan. Under the national sales tax, business is taxed on its sales minus what it purchases from other firms minus what it pays on investment and capital. That is on the sales tax.

On the flat tax, individuals pay taxes only on their wage income and not on the income from savings, such as interest or dividends. Business actually pays the taxes on savings, interest and dividend, because they are not allowed to deduct it. Businesses pay taxes on its sales minus what it buys from other firms minus investment in capital minus wages.

Now, between the business income tax and the individual income tax, what is taxed then is sales minus what business buys from other firms minus what it pays on investment and capital. So the two tax bases are the same.

Now, when it comes to administration, the flat tax is much simpler. The individual and business both fill out a short form and it is clear what is going to be taxed.

Under the sales tax, lots of things will be difficult to determine. First, there is going to be political pressure, as there is in every State that has a sales tax, not to have that sales tax on such things as food and prescription drugs, not to tax medical services or dental costs. As was the case in Michigan and in most every other state that has a sales tax, we have done this. As this happens and you reduce what is going to be taxed on food, prescription drugs, health benefits, services, what that means is the tax rate for the sales tax is going to go up.

For example, to raise the revenue that is equivalent to our 17 percent flat tax is going to require a sales tax that is much higher. In initial calculations it could be as high as a 28 percent sales tax. If it is a 28 percent sales tax, this is certainly going to lead to all sorts of incentives to hide sales, which will be easier to do than to hide income, and this will lead to an even higher sales tax. You can call them free riders or whatever you want.

But I would suggest in the sales tax effort to get rid of the IRS, in its place what we are going to do is have a new Federal police force examining what is produced so we can determine how much production is being avoided on paying the sales tax. Where you tend to say that individuals consuming are paying the sales tax, what we have done in Michigan and most other states that charge a sales tax, to simplify it, we say well, you can add the tax if you want to, but who is responsible for the sales tax are the businesses that are selling the product.

Let me just briefly show the difference in what an individual taxpayer ends up with that earns money and decides to save the money.

First, under the current system, for example, let us say after you have your income, after you spend what you are going to spend, you are fortunate enough and diligent enough that you save \$10,000, and then you end up paying 28 percent tax on the \$7,200, now on \$7,200, so what you have left, out of what you have saved and minus your tax, what you have left is \$7,200. Let us say the interest rate, or your returns on investment are maybe around 6 percent; that means I think that that money would double in about 10 years. So after 10 years, that \$7,200 that you have left after taxes doubles to \$14,000. And then what do we do under the current system? We tax you on the interest rate you earned. So if you tax on the interest on the \$7,200, as the money doubles, you end up having \$12,384.

With the flat tax that encourages savings because we do not tax savings, after expenses, you end up with \$10,000, you pay the 17 percent, and that leaves you \$8,300. In 10 years, it doubles to \$16,600, but we do not have any tax on that increased earnings of the dividends or interest, so that leaves you with a net of \$16,600. So the point that I am trying to make is you are much better off and it encourages savings and investment, which is key to the kind of discoveries that we can have for businesses to be more competitive in a world market.

I think a problem with the sales tax is determining what is a final retail sale. In trying to change our sales tax in Michigan to take in some services, the overwhelming problem is what is the final retail sale that you charge a sales tax on? For example, say I am an accountant and I do your books, I am going to charge you a sales tax on it as the final user. But what if I am the same accountant, but I am doing the

books for a local retail store, and that retail store is going to take the increased cost that they pay for that bookkeeper and add it to the price of their product; the sales tax is going on the price of their product, so you do not charge sales tax when you are an accountant doing work for a firm or a retailer that can pass that tax on in a product that is going to be taxed on the sales tax. It is complicated. It is complicated, figuring out what you are going to tax sales tax on.

Because of the fact that the advocates of the fair tax and the sales tax suggest that we want to change the 16th Amendment to the Constitution, a political complication of talking this chamber into having a two-thirds vote that is going to change the Constitution, and then after that, you have to have three-quarters of the States agree to ratify what has been suggested as a constitutional change.

Pretend for a moment that you are back in that State legislature, and here is the Federal Government saying, look, we want to change the system to get rid of the income tax and have a sales tax. We would sort of like you as the State to collect that money for us, for the Federal Government because, look, you are going to have a sales tax anyway in your State because you cannot copy the Federal income tax any more because we are going to have a sales tax, but we would also like you to collect the sales tax for the Federal Government, State legislatures and governor. We also are suggesting that you have this sales tax that we are going to pass into law and that it be on services and drugs, that it be on medical supplies. It is going to be a tough getting three-quarters of those States to ratify the Constitution with that kind of threat that they are going to have to be the instigators of that sales tax in their State.

I think what is likely is that all of the problems of a sales tax, how it is going to be administered, what do you calculate as the final sale that is going to be taxed for the sales tax, and the complicated effort of convincing States that they have to be a part of this effort to now expand their sales tax and maybe even start collecting it for the Federal Government.

A third problem has to do with purchases, for example, over the Internet. You might make purchases from another country over the Internet, and that is more and more available. How are these going to be taxed? What is likely is that they will not be and, thus, U.S. retailers will be at a disadvantage compared to foreign retailers. I think these are just a few of the problems in implementing a national retail sales tax.

The fact that no State has successfully managed to put in place a true retail sales tax that captures all final goods and services should tell us that it will be very difficult to do at the national level also.

Okay, back again, reviewing. Implementation, the flat tax is just going to

be a bill passed by a majority and signed by the President. The sales tax, it is the bill, plus the constitutional amendment. The burden on States on the flat tax: none. On a sales tax, the States must collect the Federal taxes, often new ones on services; and for those States that do not have a sales tax, implementing that kind of a tax structure in those States.

The burden on the taxpayer. We have seen the simple form for a flat tax. On the sales tax, there is no form for individuals, but it is going to end up with much more business monitoring to know how much is being produced to determine what is being avoided in the sales tax, and the risk of tax evasion. The risk of tax evasion with a flat tax is the same as the current tax system. But with a sales tax, the high tax on goods increases the incentives for invasion. It increases the incentives to trade with your neighbor instead of paying a very high sales tax that I have estimated will go to 28 percent, maybe even higher.

In conclusion, let me just suggest that getting back to our predicament of over-spending, over-promising, the challenges that we face with medicare and Social Security, the challenges we face with paying our veterans' benefits, the challenges we face coming up with retirement benefits for Federal employees, means that we need to make the kind of changes in government that is going to help make sure that this country stays on the cutting edge of competition in the new challenging world market. And one of the tools that we can use to do this is getting rid of the IRS, getting rid of the complicated Tax Code that has preferences based on the strength of PACs and lobbyists that have influenced this and the other chamber and the White House over the last 50 years, and come up with a tax system that is going to be better for individuals, it is going to be better for the long-term competition that future generations are going to face.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2004, AT PAGE H7232

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 361. To designate certain conduct by sports agents relating to the signing of contracts with student athletes as unfair and deceptive acts or practices to be regulated by the Federal Trade Commission.

H.R. 3908. To provide for the conveyance of the real property located at 1081 West Main Street in Ravenna, Ohio.

H.R. 5008. To provide an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1576. An act to revise the boundary of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2004, AT PAGE H7234

H. Res. 776. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to estimates and analyses of the cost of the Medicare prescription drug legislation; referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committees concerned.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FROST (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. BAIRD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and September 22 on account of attending the funeral of a close friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WICKER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN) to revise and